

August 16, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19735

in a different world and on borrowed time.

I not only introduce the legislation; I support it and trust that the Ways and Means Committee will open hearings during the present session or during the recess. We must act before those who have little sympathy for our industry go to the extremes now contemplated, namely, a 50-percent tariff cut across the board with only minor exceptions.

*To [Signature]*  
SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable regret and a heavy heart that I take this time this afternoon but I do so on a matter of great importance, in my judgment, both to the House of Representatives and certainly to myself.

On last Thursday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] made some remarks which I think were probably among the most serious ever made by one Member against another Member in the history of this body.

The United Press of that day reported as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, said today current unofficial hearings at which Congressmen have been soliciting views on Vietnam are giving "aid and comfort" to the Communists.

HAYS in a House speech directed his critical remarks particularly at Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York, one of several Members who have conducted such informal sessions.

HAYS said the sessions have provided a forum for "crackpots" to air their views in opposition to U.S. participation in the Vietnam fighting. He said ROSENTHAL had been "helping the Communists" by holding such meetings. "He's giving aid and comfort to them," he said.

The dispatch continued:

HAYS' remarks were prompted by a statement by ROSENTHAL on another issue. ROSENTHAL had told the House U.N. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, according to press reports, would announce shortly a more flexible U.S. policy toward Russia's nonpayment of U.N. peacekeeping assessments.

HAYS said he doubted that ROSENTHAL knew, since the matter was still under study, and that anyway ROSENTHAL was helping Russia by suggesting to Russia in advance that she need not make further concessions in this U.N. dispute.

He said ROSENTHAL was "aiding the Communists" in this case "just as he has been helping the Communists in Vietnam" by holding meetings on Vietnam. He said ROSENTHAL had been incorrectly implying that the hearings were sponsored by the Foreign Affairs members.

For the attention of those Members who have not had the opportunity to read these remarks in the RECORD, they appear at page 19607 of the RECORD of August 12, 1965.

It seems to me that when one Member accuses another Member of aiding the Communists and giving aid and comfort to the Communists, he is bordering on the charge that the other Member is guilty of treason. This, I believe, is a very serious charge and must be an-

swered in its entirety, not only by myself but by other interested parties.

Frankly, when the gentleman from Ohio made his remarks, I was rather taken aback and shocked. My subsequent reaction was one of hurt, because Mr. HAYS is the chairman of my subcommittee on State Department Affairs. He is, in my judgment, a respected Member of the House, a man for whom I have considerable respect and even admiration, a man with whom I have had the pleasure of having lunch at the same table in the House restaurant perhaps 100 times since I have been in Congress, and a man who has done me a number of personal favors. Only within the last week or two he did something for which I was very grateful to him. Thus; when he made these very serious charges, I wondered if perhaps there was not something wrong with me—if there was not something I had done directly to Mr. HAYS to cause him to make what I believe is probably one of the most serious charges ever made in this Chamber.

At the time of the incident, I could have, as all Members know, risen to a point of order and asked that his words be taken down. At that point had the Speaker ruled in my favor, the words and Mr. HAYS' remarks would have been removed from the body of the RECORD. But the damage would have been done in the press. It was my immediate judgment, whether good or bad, that it would be better to face the entire issue, and better to face the remarks so that we might all reflect on them at some other time rather than have the matter disposed of at the moment.

I was at a loss to explain Mr. HAYS' attack. Yet I knew he must have realized that anything he said, one Democrat against another, would carry very, very serious political implications. When I had thoroughly exhausted the possibilities of my behavior having caused his remarks, I then began to wonder about him. Of course, I had no basis for any personal feelings for him other than respect and admiration and, a modest degree of affection. I then waited until the next day, until the newspapers reported the incident. I should be honest and tell you I had hoped there would be little press reaction. But in the Long Island Press of Friday, August 13, which is the most important paper in my district, there appeared a headline in about 1-inch type which said, "Abet the Commies? Absurd: ROSENTHAL." In other words, while I did have a chance to make a response, the attack had put me completely on the defensive.

New York Times of Friday, August 13, 1965, carried the first half of the UPI story. But they carried the charge and not my response. They said as follows:

Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, said today that unofficial hearings at which Congressmen had been soliciting views on Vietnam were giving "aid and comfort" to the Communists.

Mr. HAYS, in a House speech, directed his critical remarks particularly at Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of Queens, one of several members who have conducted the informal sessions.

Mr. HAYS said the hearings had provided a forum for "crackpots" to air their views in opposition to U.S. participation in the Viet-

nam fighting. He said Mr. ROSENTHAL had been "helping the Communists" by holding such meetings.

And the New York Daily News of the same day, Friday, August 13, 1965, carried the story which said in the headline, "L.B.J. Supports Lodge on Vietnam," but, in the bottom of the story, recorded the same essential charge that I was giving aid and comfort to the Communists.

It was then that I realized the matter had to be faced directly, then that I was obliged to look at what Mr. HAYS had said in the past remarks on the floor of the House, then that I sought to discover whether he had ever questioned the integrity of other Members of Congress. I supposed if I could find some clue along these lines, I might then find the answer as to why he chose to attack me.

I was particularly surprised at one of the gentlemen's statements, made on October 31, 1963, on page 20679 of the RECORD, where Mr. HAYS said:

Mr. Speaker, I have been reading in the press about various people being called pinkies, Communists, and what-have-you by other Members of the House. I have never stooped to calling anybody a Communist or any other vile name, but I would point out, having some knowledge of communism, that one of the Communists' chief tactics and one of their chief tactics, as well as the Nazi murderers' principal tactics, was to call somebody they disagreed with a dirty name such as a Communist or for a Communist to call someone a Nazi. I wonder if those who play this game should not be suspect as to their own political philosophies? In other words, the big lie technique.

Given the quality of his attack on me, I was puzzled by the very tolerant sentiments of that particular statement.

I continued looking at other comments and came across one which indicated another saddening tactic—the old charge of guilt by association. This occurred on June 7, 1957, on page 8533, where Mr. HAYS said as follows:

I have always been told if you have evidence introduced—I am not an attorney, so I am trying in my feeble way to refute this—if you have evidence introduced, you consider from whence this evidence comes. Since Mr. POWELL is the sole source of this statement and since Mr. POWELL has made this accusation against Members from Pennsylvania and Ohio, maybe we should consider some of his previous statements. Why he made this accusation I do not know. I suppose that is as hard to explain as it would be to explain why he appeared with Earl Browder and William Z. Foster at a joint rally of the Communist Party in Madison Square Garden in 1944 and shared top billing with those two. Or it might be as hard to explain why he was the editor of a newspaper and the author of a column in which he one time identified the New York Times as "a Salsberger Journal of first-class Negro baiters."

I have heard the New York Times called just the opposite on this floor by many more people than the gentleman from New York, Mr. POWELL. Or why when one time, when the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Dies, had the temerity to summon one of the columnists of Mr. POWELL's newspaper before his Committee on Un-American Activities, the Reverend Mr. POWELL wrote, "The sooner Dies is buried, the better." And he goes on quoting a lot of other trash that I will not quote because I do not want it to appear in the RECORD.

19736

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 16, 1965

He [Mr. POWELL] winds up by saying, "The death of Dies is just as important as the death of Hitler." Well, Mr. Dies is here, full of vim, vigor, and vitality, I am happy to say. So that wish of the reverend gentleman from New York had no more reason that his dishonest statement against Members of Congress from Pennsylvania and Ohio.

Mr. HAYS seems to have been particularly worried about other Members' attitudes toward communism. In exchange with Mr. CURTIS, of Missouri, on page 4305, March 15, 1962, the gentleman from Ohio said this:

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say to the gentleman who is interested in fighting communism that in my opinion each one of us who fights down here in the well by doing a lot of talking is not doing any effective fighting like some of us do back in the precincts.

Such matters, as we all know, are politically very delicate. They deserve restraint and caution. But so do any remarks made by Members about fellow Democrats. This is why I was disturbed by remarks by the gentlemen on page 6540, of the RECORD of April 18, 1965:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say this about the great golfing Governor of Ohio—

Incidentally, the Governor was a Democrat, just as I am. the Governor of Ohio who reputedly shoots a lower score than the President and who has through his opposition to adequate financing tried to ruin the school system of Ohio and who in his tenure as Governor has permitted Ohio's highways to deteriorate until they are among the worst in the Nation. Knowing him as I do, perhaps I should say in my opinion, he would have kicked the farmers of the Nation in the teeth before he teed off on the first hole; he wouldn't have waited to have a conference in the golf shop on the ninth hole.

I have found, to continue, that I was not the first to take time to respond to charges made by Mr. HAYS. On page 21103, September 27, 1962, Mr. Alger, of Texas, had the following to say:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to the House that the statement made yesterday by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HAYS, in which the gentleman from Texas now addressing the House and the gentleman from New York, Mr. Pillion, were mentioned, I have been assured privately, in no sense was intended to be derogatory, that we would be slow to hit the beaches with the gentleman from Ohio in case we ever, God forbid, became engaged in combat. I understand that no such implication was intended either in that part that was added under permission to revise which we did not hear on the floor.

That a Member of this body had seen fit to question the courage of his fellows, apparently to deny it later—all this seemed to me deeply puzzling. Yet there were other unexplainable incidents. On January 17, 1963, page 542 of the RECORD, appears the following:

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to a great part of the speech which was made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Cannon. I am sure all of us are concerned about the debt. But I might say in the 14 years I have been here I have never been before the Committee on Appropriations one single time and asked them for one single appropriation. But I would have been a lot more impressed still

if I had not been around here last year and had seen the spectacle of the fight for prestige that went on and a considerable number of weeks of the time of the Congress and the country wasted. I would have been more impressed if the chairman would have devoted himself at that point to trying to reduce the debt instead of trying to increase his own prestige.

Is there not a better way to conduct the discourse of politics, regardless of how strong one's sentiments?

Mr. Speaker, other Members have taken special orders to respond to Mr. HAYS before with reference to his accusations. One such example was May 18, 1961, at page 8405 of the RECORD when the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Schwengel, had the following to say:

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on occasions, Members of the House get carried away or for some reason become careless with their thinking and speech and in the process reflect upon the good character and record of distinguished public servants and private individuals in our country.

This, in my opinion, was the case, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], referred to a very dear friend of mine and a friend of thousands of people in Iowa as a broken-down politician during a colloquy on the House floor when we were discussing some matters that had little relationship, if any, to people like Mr. Whitney Gilliland of whom the gentleman from Ohio spoke when he said, I quote:

"If they cannot find a Kennedy, maybe they can find a broken-down politician from Iowa like Gilliland that Eisenhower put on the CAB."

Is such an approach really necessary? Does it fit the traditions of this body?

Mr. Speaker, I also discovered that both Senators from Ohio had felt the sting of Mr. HAYS' tongue. Perhaps this was State politics. However, in my case I really cannot understand how there would be any political motivation by making remarks that would apparently increase the chances of my not being returned to this body.

Yet Mr. HAYS had been active in Ohio. On November 12, 1963, at page 21578, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio said the following:

This article by Tom Talburt, Washington correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, contains the following specific statements made by Representative HAYS:

"Congressman WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, says he understands why both of Ohio's Democratic Senators oppose a congressional pay raise. He says they're not worth it.

"HAYS, who's backing a proposed pay boost, said he'll offer an amendment to pay legislators on a sliding scale from \$5,000 to \$35,000 a year and let each Member decide for himself how much he is worth.

"If my amendment passes and either Ohio Senator says he's worth more than \$5,000, he could be tried for perjury,' snapped HAYS.

"After placing rather dubious prices on the heads of Senators FRANK LAUSCHE and STEPHEN YOUNG, HAYS was asked to evaluate his own performance.

"I'm worth the maximum,' he declared."

I am not pleased with such remarks. I am not happy to have to bring them to the attention of the House. But I have been attacked, and made vulnerable to serious political charges at home. That I am obliged to defend myself is not my fault. And this is why I am taking the time of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, other examples, some more pungent and some less pungent, of the gentleman from Ohio's habits of political discourse. But perhaps Mr. HAYS himself summed up his own style when on May 24, 1950, at page 7636 of the RECORD of the House, Mr. HAYS, of Ohio, said as follows:

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I also recognize that the statement which I inserted is a technical violation of the rules. The remarks which were made were not, in my opinion, particularly offensive to the gentleman in the other body, and I might say, not anywhere near as offensive, not one-tenth of 1 percent as offensive as some statements I have made from the public platform without congressional immunity about the aforementioned gentleman. With that statement, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, I have neither the experience nor the training to understand why there are times when the gentleman from Ohio chooses to say unexpectedly critical things about other Members.

And sometimes they have been almost as serious as the one he said about me.

What, then, Mr. Speaker, did he charge me with? He charged me with three things: He charged me with breaching and violating the security of the briefing given by Ambassador Goldberg to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and of announcing in advance what this country's position is in regard to the United Nations. He then charged me with giving aid to the Communists by holding public hearings in my district. And he charged me with being misleading in suggesting that these hearings had the official sanction of the House.

With regard to the first citation, the briefing held by the committee, I would like to advise you, Mr. Speaker, this was not the first occasion on which Mr. HAYS has charged a Member of the House with violating security.

On October 23, 1964, he charged the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] with probably the "biggest intelligence break that Peking has had vis-a-vis the United States." And he also said he hoped the people of Delaware would take cognizance of the action of McDowell in breaking American security. Is this proper politics between Democratic colleagues?

What I read to you is a direct quote from the Wilmington Evening Journal of October 23, 1964:

Mr. McDowell, in response to Mr. HAYS' accusation, said, "The insinuation that I broke any security regulation is completely false."

HAYS said "McDowell's remarks were of unquestionable and inestimable value to the Chinese Communists."

Mr. McDowell said he could not understand Mr. HAYS' reaction. He said any one of the U.S. methods of surveillance have been fully available to the public press for several months.

So I was not the first Democrat charged by Mr. HAYS with breach of security. In any case, the charge against me was quite without foundation.

In the RECORD of August 12, 1965, I began my remarks by saying:

Mr. Speaker, on next Monday it is reported, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg will an-

August 16, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300130013-1  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19737

ounce a more flexible American position on peacekeeping —

And in the next to the last paragraph I stated:

If this is to be the substance of Ambassador Goldberg's speech to the 33-nation committee on United Nations finance, then I am anxious to register my highest regard for such enlightened policy.

I inserted in the RECORD at that point a New York Times editorial of that morning, August 12 which said:

Washington's plan to announce a more flexible position on peacekeeping assessments may prove a lifesaver for the United Nations.

The editorial goes on to discuss the United States proposal for a new approach to peacekeeping assessments.

With regard to the United Nations, on August 11, 1965, a New York Times carried a story under the byline of Richard Eder. The headline says, "End of U.S. Fight on U.N. Dues Seen." Below that, "Goldberg Is Reported Ready To Announce Policy Shift."

The Washington Star headline of August 10 stated, "U.S. To Abandon Fight for Soviet U.N. Dues." And immediately under, a subheading, "Goldberg Monday Will Agree To Scrap Article 19 for Contribution Device."

A United Press dispatch appearing that morning before the House met reads as follows:

As it stood, before the last-minute hitch yesterday, the administration planned to make an announcement in New York Monday to this effect:

The United States still holds to its legal view that the U.N. Charter means what it says.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this dispatch in the RECORD at this point, together with the other newspaper stories I referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matters referred to follow:

UPI RELEASE

As it stood, before the last-minute hitch yesterday, the administration planned to make an announcement in New York Monday to this effect:

The United States still holds to its legal view that the U.N. Charter means what it says, that "the expenses of the organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly," and that, under article 19, a member more than 2 years in arrears "shall have no vote."

However, if the U.N. membership is unwilling to enforce article 19 the United States will go along, but will regard its own payments as voluntary contributions rather than mandatory.

This would be a major U.S. shift. On October 8, 1964, the United States submitted a memorandum to the United Nations saying that failure to enforce article 19 would "undermine the constitutional integrity" of the world organization.

The memorandum said such a view would be a repudiation of the International Court of Justice, which ruled in 1962 that assessments are mandatory, and would "tempt members to pick and choose" which U.N. obligations they would fulfill.

"How could any organization function on such a fiscal quicksand?" the memorandum asked.

What brought about the U.S. change was a realization that the U.N. membership was not prepared to enforce article 19. The organization has virtually paralyzed itself for the past year by suspending voting in order to avoid a showdown.

Administration officials were well aware their move would be seen by some critics as a U.S. "surrender." Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, of Iowa, said after a Goldberg briefing yesterday that the United States was getting ready to "tuck its tail between its legs."

But the administration argues that it is better to slide around a legal point than to see the United Nations paralyzed for still another year. As one U.S. diplomat put it: "All those legal opinions we wrote a year ago are still true. But this has become a matter of practical politics."

The move would be significant in U.N. history. Under the charter, an assessment of expenses on members was the only so-called mandatory power given the General Assembly.

UNITED STATES TO ABANDON FIGHT FOR SOVIET U.N. DUES—GOLDBERG MONDAY WILL AGREE TO SCRAP ARTICLE 19 FOR "CONTRIBUTION" DEVICE

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Next Monday, the United States plans to abandon its long fight to force Russia to pay her United Nations dues, it has been learned here. Russia then is expected to make a "voluntary" contribution in September or October.

Defeat for Washington on the Russian-dues issue has been considered inevitable for months. U.N. diplomats long have known the United States did not have the votes to put the squeeze on the Kremlin, requiring payment or taking away Russia's voting rights.

Next Monday, U.S. Delegate Arthur J. Goldberg will bow publicly out of the effort, according to the present plans. He will agree to shelve article 19 of the U.N. Charter, which says countries 2 years in arrears shall have no vote in the General Assembly.

After the Russians have cast several votes in the 1965 Assembly, which meets in September, they are expected to make a "voluntary" contribution that will be "substantial" but much less than the \$62 million they owe.

Thereafter the United States, too, is expected to contribute to a "save the U.N." fund and other countries will do the same, in the hope of erasing a \$108 million U.N. deficit.

In addition, however, the U.N. must pay off some \$180 million in bonds floated to pay for peace operations in the Congo and Middle East. Russia has refused to pay her share toward amortizing this debt.

The Johnson administration's decision to swallow defeat came after long and careful consultation \* \* \* which felt that the overriding time an explosion of indignation was feared.

The danger apparently was overrated. Sources say there proved to be three major factions in Congress:

1. Those who felt the United States should fight to the end. This group dwindled as the months passed, and at the last was very small.

2. A group, largely pro-U.N., which felt that the overriding necessity was to free the world organization from paralysis over the issue, even though it would mean loss, for the foreseeable future, of the U.N.'s legal power to tax its members for peacekeeping actions.

3. A group, largely anti-U.N., which welcomed loss of the U.N.'s tax power, fearing it might one day be used to embarrass the United States.

MAJORITY IN ANY CASE

By whatever process of reasoning the conclusion was reached, a majority decided the United States should bow out of the struggle as gracefully as possible.

The administration settled upon this course in late spring or early summer, and thereafter the only problem was how to save the most face.

One device, urged by British Delegate Lord Caradon, was to save the law by changing the facts, that is, to have the U.N. Assembly convert all past contributions for peacekeeping into voluntary contributions, so that anyone who had not made a contribution was not legally in arrears.

U.S. experts considered that this wouldn't wash, that it was too drastic and too obviously contrived. It could still happen, even now, despite American skepticism; but the United States is not expected to urge it.

Instead, the United States is expected to endorse a relatively simple Ethiopian plan, or some close variant of it, under which the U.N. would merely decide that article 19 should not or will not be raised in the Assembly. This will mean that business can "proceed normally" in September when the Assembly reconvenes.

SHOWDOWN AVOIDED

Previously, ever since January of 1964, the Assembly has been unable to act on controversial issues for fear of an explosive showdown on article 19. Beginning in December 1964, a device of unanimous consent was adopted to avoid determining which countries had the right to vote. Only a relatively few matters could be handled this way.

The result was that the 114-nation Assembly was rendered inoperative, with the veto-bound Security Council the U.N.'s only practical resource in the political field. This in turn enhanced the power of the Soviet veto. Virtually nothing could be done of which Russia did not approve.

The forum in which Goldberg will disclose the new American stand is expected to be a 33-nation Finance Committee which is due to resume August 16. The present plan is for Goldberg to be among the first speakers.

There will be a note of irony for the new American representative in that his first major appearance will be to break bad news to the American public and to accept reversal of a World Court opinion.

Goldberg came to the U.N. from the U.S. Supreme Court, and has said he wants to build up the rule of law. The World Court ruled in 1962 that article 19 could be enforced in the present case.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 1, 1965]

END OF U.S. FIGHT ON U.N. DUES SEEN—GOLDBERG IS REPORTED READY TO ANNOUNCE POLICY SHIFT

(By Richard Elder)

WASHINGTON, August 10.—The United States will give up its long fight to get the Soviet Union to contribute to peacekeeping operations of the United Nations, according to reliable official sources here.

This policy shift, which has been considered inevitable since last December, is to be publicly announced next Monday. At that time, Arthur J. Goldberg, the new U.S. representative at the United Nations, will address a special 33-nation committee that has been studying the question of delinquent assessments.

The Soviet Union and its allies and several other countries have refused to contribute to peacekeeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East. Other nations contended that the arrears of the objecting members had built up past the point at which, accord-

19738

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 16, 1965

ing to article 19 of the charter, those countries were no longer entitled to vote in the General Assembly.

The sum charged to the Soviet Union as arrears is \$62,236,000, of which \$21.6 million would be for this year. The total of the sums carried as arrears stands at \$128 million. Other countries that have refused to contribute to the peacekeeping operations are Czechoslovakia, Byelorussia, the Ukraine, Romania, Poland, Cuba, Hungary, Albania, France, and South Africa.

Throughout last year, the United States lobbied vigorously to obtain a General Assembly majority for compelling the Soviet Union to pay or lose its vote. Although the majority was believed to have been available, some U.S. officials contended that to force the matter would disrupt the United Nations. This argument prevailed.

The United States agreed to avoid a showdown, and a complicated formula was adopted under which no votes were taken during the last Assembly session. Because of this next to no business was done.

#### APPROACH DISCUSSED

Officials here believe that the decision to avoid a showdown has undermined any chance of rallying a new anti-Soviet majority at the 20th Assembly session which opens September 21. It is believed that the United States could, at best, fight only a rearguard action against the Soviet right to vote.

The current discussion in the administration is on the manner in which the United States should signify that it has given up the fight.

Some officials and other persons close to the situation report that Mr. Goldberg favors making a clear-cut announcement Monday that the United States has dropped its insistence on linking the penalties of article 19 to peacekeeping operations authorized by the General Assembly.

Other State Department officials are reported to oppose this, saying the United States should insist that the Soviet Union pay while indicating quietly that it would accept whatever the General Assembly decided this fall.

#### CONTRIBUTION OFFERED

Mr. Goldberg issued a statement calling reports that the United States would drop its insistence on enforcing article 19 not accurate. He added that the question was still being discussed and that the U.S. position will be explained fully and clearly when the committee of 33 convenes on August 16.

The United Nations delegate discussed the question before a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning. Later this week he will appear before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Soviet Union contends that only the Security Council can authorize peacekeeping operations, and that it is not obliged to pay for operations authorized by the General Assembly. The United States, and most United Nations members, argue that the General Assembly can act when the Security Council is unable through vetoes to do so.

MR. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, another interesting part of this experience is that on the previous day there was a colloquy on this floor between Mr. HAYS and Mr. SISK, of California. This colloquy is to be found on page 19242 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 11, 1965. Mr. HAYS said:

If I were the gentleman from California, and he is a very close friend of mine and a distinguished Member of this body, I would not go too far out on the limb betting that that story is wrong.

That was referring to the UN story. Then Mr. SISK replied:

I might say to my good friend I am not betting on it one way or the other. I am simply saying, based on the information I have, I think the story is not necessarily true because the decision has not been made. It may be that the story in the future may prove to be true but I question its truthfulness as of last night or as of this time.

Mr. HAYS then replied:

I do not know how true it was last night and I do not know how true it is this minute, but if I were a betting man I would be willing to bet a year's salary that the new Ambassador to the United Nations will make that statement next Monday.

That is the statement by Mr. HAYS which was made approximately 24 hours before my own statement was made in the well of this House.

Other of his charges accuse me of giving aid and comfort to the Communists in holding hearings in my congressional district seeking grassroot opinions on the war in Vietnam.

On this matter, I think it is interesting to bring to the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the remarks Mr. HAYS made on September 30, 1964, in the Appendix of the RECORD of that day which are on pages 5035 and 5036 as follows:

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to reacquaint its officers with the thinking and views of Americans in communities across the land, the Department of State is encouraging Foreign Service officers on leave from foreign assignments to accept invitations to meet with community groups, service clubs, churches, and other organizations. This program is under the direction of Mrs. Katie Loucheim, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and long an advocate of an increased dialog between American communities and the Foreign Service officers who represent us abroad.

Through such contacts our Foreign Service officers are able to familiarize themselves with grassroots thinking on a host of domestic and international subjects and to become acquainted with developments in our rapidly changing society.

He goes on to insert an article entitled "New Communications With Grassroots America," which endorses the idea that members of the executive branch ought to find out what people are thinking. Ought this not also be the duty of Congressmen? On what grounds would the gentleman endorse those meetings and attack mine?

A story of the Long Island Press of August 7, 1965, which announced my hearings, said:

#### ROSENTHAL TO HOLD VIET HEARINGS FRIDAY

Congressman BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Elmhurst Democrat, will hold an open hearing on Vietnam at 9:30 a.m. Friday in Borough Hall, Kew Gardens.

The hearings, which the lawmaker says are to get the grassroots sentiments of his constituents, will be held in the old traffic courthouse.

A member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, ROSENTHAL asked all those interested in expressing their views to write his Washington office.

Although the hearings are not official, ROSENTHAL said he would compile a report to be distributed to Congress, the State Department and the White House.

A New York Times story that followed the hearings on Saturday, August 7, 1965, is an article written by Tania Long; it said:

However, the all-day session was unofficial, but a stenographic record was taken.

In my opening remarks at the hearing, of which I hold in my hand a stenographic record, I said on page 2: "This unofficial congressional hearing will begin a little late."

On page 5 of those hearings, I said, and I quote:

I want to emphasize that this is an unofficial hearing, not authorized by any congressional committee, but will be conducted in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives with the one exception that the press, radio, and photographers will be permitted.

There could hardly have been any ambiguity here. I was quite clear in emphasizing the unofficial nature of the hearings.

At the hearing, Mr. Speaker, 35 witnesses testified, all residents of my congressional district or those representing organizations whose principal activities are conducted in my congressional district, offering many and varied views. What was the reaction to such hearings? Many seemed to agree with the viewpoint of the New York Times.

On this Saturday, August 14, 1965, the New York Times carried the following editorial entitled "Listening Posts on Vietnam." I read as follows:

The gloominess of the options the United States faces in Vietnam makes it important that the country's policymakers keep open the fullest opportunities for two-way communication between them and the American people. President Johnson has been alert in recent weeks to the necessity for informing both Congress and the country of the motivations and limitations of American involvement.

A small group of Congressmen have decided that they can best discharge their obligations in helping to shape policy by holding unofficial hearings in their districts, at which opponents and proponents of American actions in Vietnam set forth their views. Most of these hearings have elicited a broad range of opinion in keeping with the best traditions of free inquiry and expression. The one-sidedness that too often has characterized college teach-ins has been notably absent.

Despite this accent on the democratic interplay of ideas, the hearings have come under attack in the House by Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio. He charges that they provide a forum for "crackpots" and give aid and comfort to the Communists. The notion that free discussion must be a casualty of the Vietnamese war impresses us at much more destructive of American values than any viewpoint that might be set forth at the hearings. We hope more Congressmen will hold them as a demonstration of democratic vitality.

Those Members of whom the Times editorial speaks—who have either held or participated in such hearings—are: Representatives KASTENMEIER, BINGHAM, DIGGS, BROOMFIELD, RYAN, RESNICK, and FARSTEIN.

I have received dozens of letters, Mr. Speaker, on the subject since the articles about Mr. HAYS' charge appeared in the paper. One that came in not from my district but from an adjacent district across the Long Island Sound I would like to read. It is from Pastor George Koski of the Bernadotte Evangelical Lutheran Church, Strang and Murdock Avenues in the Bronx. It says:

DEAR MR. ROSENTHAL: It is good to see that you are holding informal sessions at which the people can voice their views on the complicated questions of the war in Vietnam.

Of course, these hearings are not a fully satisfactory substitute for the official inquiry which should be launched by the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees, but at least they represent the beginning of a congressional search for understanding which can lay the basis for sound policy.

I cannot agree with those who feel that the Communists are receiving "aid and comfort" from these meetings. Our Nation has grown great not through the suppression of dissent but rather through the full exercise of our freedoms of belief, expression, and association. Contrary to the views of some legislators, it is not the constitutional duty of Congress to duck big questions. Vietnam is a big question. It should not be ducked.

Your sincerely,

PASTOR GEORGE KOSKI.

Mr. Speaker, I have sought to answer strong charges made against me by a colleague and fellow Democrat. I regret that these have been made. I regret even more that I have had to respond to them in this fashion. But I knew of no other way to clear my own good name which, it seems to me, is put in question by accusations that I am the sort to "give aid and comfort to the enemy." This has been an unfortunate affair.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress I have been deeply impressed by the courtesy generally extended by Members to each other on this floor, even when they differ profoundly on issues. I was therefore deeply shocked by the attack that was made last Thursday by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] on my colleague from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL]. I do not believe it is necessary for me to discuss in detail the reasons given by the gentleman from Ohio for his criticisms. They have been dealt with very ably and completely by my colleague from New York. I should like merely to add a few comments.

First, it was clear, as he had just now told the House, from Mr. ROSENTHAL's statement on August 12, that he was referring to press reports as to what Ambassador Goldberg's position was going to be and that he was not disclosing or discussing any confidential information. Nor was he making any announcements of U.S. policy.

Secondly, my colleague was expressing his support for the idea of a flexible U.S. position on the article 19 issue. I likewise expressed my support for such a position on August 12. This is essentially the position which President Johnson, through Ambassador Goldberg, has now announced.

Third, at the invitation of my colleague [Mr. ROSENTHAL], I joined him in the informal hearing he conducted in his district 10 days ago. Various points of view were expressed there, just as they had been at a forum I helped to put on in my district some weeks before. If such expressions of opinion at the grassroots of our country give aid and comfort to the Communists, then I say God help us.

The day we seek to choke off the free expression of citizen opinion, that day we will have taken a long step toward totalitarianism. We shall be in danger of losing the very freedom we are fighting for in Vietnam.

Parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, and so that there may be no misreading of my position, I want to say that in spite of great concern and misgivings on some points, I support the broad outlines of the President's policy in Vietnam as I understand it. I expect to have more to say on that subject in a day or two.

Fourth, the gentleman from Ohio was quite mistaken in his charge that my colleague from New York had given the impression that the hearing in his district was some sort of Foreign Affairs Committee hearing. It was clear from Mr. ROSENTHAL's statements both before and after the hearing that this was an informal session with no official status. It was on this basis that I took part in it.

These are agonizing days, Mr. Speaker, for the President of the United States and for all of us. We are confronted with awesome and difficult decisions on which good men and true, loyal Americans, may differ. When a private citizen accuses another private citizen with whom he disagrees of giving aid and comfort to the enemy, that serves no good purpose and is regrettable. When one Member of this House so accuses a colleague on the floor of this House, it is deplorable, and it will only impede the important work we have to do here.

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason for the rules of this House requiring that Members control their tempers and enjoining courtesy upon them.

If I may, as a freshman Member, say so, those rules are wise.

I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me..

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlemen from New York for yielding to me so that I might take this opportunity to offer some observations in connection with the proceedings known as "Hearings on Vietnam" held in various Members' districts.

I do this because I think in certain quarters a considerable misunderstanding has arisen as to the nature of these proceedings and as to what they purport to be. At a later date I will report more fully the unofficial hearings conducted by myself in Madison on July 30 and 31.

I support what the gentlemen from New York [Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. ROSENTHAL] have already said in connection with the proceedings that they participated in.

However, at this time I should like to state that at the very outset the proceedings were described as unofficial or not authorized by a congressional committee or the Congress and were further described as being conducted in my representatives capacity as a Member of Congress solely. There was no suggestion that these were official and to my knowl-

edge this inference was not drawn by anyone who had taken the trouble to read or inquire what the proceedings were about. Secondly, I would like to make a brief observation or two about the participation in these hearings. I do this because some quarters, including in my case, one State senator from the State of Wisconsin, Senator Gordon Roseliep, who has taken the liberty of transmitting to various Members of Congress an undated press release in criticism of the proceedings I was conducting, have betrayed a woeful lack of information on this matter.

The principle misconception is that the hearings were conducted solely or primarily to provide these administration critics of Vietnam policy or even in some cases "leftists" a forum to express their views. In all the hearings that I have been familiar with, and certainly I can speak for the Madison proceedings, organizations and experts were invited and in fact did participate in support of the administration and in some cases in advocacy of the military policies beyond that of the administration so that at the very least a reasonably balanced hearing took place.

In the case of the Wisconsin State senator, I am sure that, since he released his press release before the hearing took place, he was unmindful of the fact that such organizations as Young Americans for Freedom, Young GOE, The American Legion, Reserve Officers of America, Citizens To Support the People of South Vietnam, and many other organizations participated voluntarily in the proceedings. I say this because his release intimates that these proceedings are somehow sinister and darkly motivated. This just simply is not true. Various Members of Congress or, indeed, other citizens may differ whether proceedings of this sort are useful, desirable, or necessary. This may depend on one's district or one's personal views. But as far as I am concerned the cause of democracy and a free society is served by open and public discussion of policy issues of the highest concern to all citizens. We have done this to some extent in public television debate; it was done some months ago in March in the House hearings on the Sino-Soviet conflict, and it is clear to me that it is well that public discussion goes on concerning the issue of gravest importance at this time to all Americans.

A further misconception inherent in the release circulated in the name of Wisconsin State Senator Roseliep alleges the hearings play in the hands of our enemies by encouraging the communities in their belief that America is divided over the war in Vietnam.

What the gentleman seems to be saying is that free discussion of important policy matters is a luxury a democracy cannot afford in times of crisis, a proposition which is contradicted throughout the history of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include excerpts from four editorials from prominent newspapers in Wisconsin, three of which are Republican, which have clearly supported the idea of having hearings on Vietnam back home at the grassroots.

19740

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 16, 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Monroe (Wis.) Evening Times, July 23, 1965]

A good many persons from the Monroe area have indicated interest in hearing what KASTENMEIER has to say. And we hope the meeting can be held in a manner by which we all learn something of value concerning the Vietnam situation.

We don't expect any great answers to the problems of the world. But it should give us a better insight into just what Vietnam can mean to you and the fellow who lives next door.

[From the Portage (Wis.) Daily Register, Aug. 2, 1965]

Wisconsin Congressman ROBERT KASTENMEIER has led the way in what we cannot help but think is an admirable cause. It is a political cause, too. It will help the energetic KASTENMEIER's image; but, mainly, it is an attempt to wake up the people of the home district and make them aware that the national and international problems which face our Nation face them also.

Bob KASTENMEIER may have gained publicity by holding his hearing. If so, he richly deserves it, for we, in turn, have gained some small lesson in the degree of our apathy toward the decisions of our Government, and in the necessity of our becoming more aware of what is happening on the national-international scene.

[From the Waukesha Freeman, July 21, 1965]

It is responsive to this overwhelming sentiment that he wants public discussion of the issue. It is our feeling, as well as his, that the American people ought to be heard on what this country's course shall be prior to involvement so serious that there would be no other choice than all-out war.

[From the Madison Capital Times, July 19, 1965]

If ever there was a need for discussion and debate on any issue faced by the American people it is on this question of the gathering war in Vietnam.

We are well on the way to what might be the most destructive war in history. But there has been scarcely any debate on the decisions which have so deeply involved this country.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take long to express my thinking. I have read the remarks of the gentleman from New York and I have read the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from New York, coupled with his observations today, much better serve the cause of free speech in this country, much better serve our historic American tradition of freedom, and much better serve the cause of freedom today than the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks of my colleagues concerning the incident which has been the subject of this discussion this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I read the statement which my distinguished friend from New

York [Mr. Rosenthal] made about the prospective policy position of the U.S. Government in connection with the payment of United Nations assessments. I thought that his statement was not only in order but was well reasoned and timely and, certainly, breached no confidence of any kind with respect to any committee hearing. I can say that with some confidence, Mr. Speaker, because I attended the committee hearings to which the gentleman from Ohio referred. I have also read the press reports, and I am certain that what the gentleman from New York was talking about was a matter of public knowledge, having been fully discussed in the press of this Nation.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that I am amazed that there should be this intolerant attitude toward the idea of holding hearings in the district of a Member of this House. In a way, it seems to me that these hearings are analogous to the practice of those Members who seek to ascertain public opinion through the use of polls. I know that many Members of the House take advantage of this opportunity. Also, in a way, it is analogous to the invitation extended by the newspapers of this Nation to have the readers comment in the newspaper giving their private and individual views.

Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that holding hearings of the kind that the gentleman from New York held promotes the public interest and serves to develop a deeper public understanding of the issues involved and helps to enlighten the Members whose responsibility it is to both serve the constituents of their own districts and the welfare of the Nation.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, I discussed with the gentleman from New York the nature of the hearings he was proposing to hold. It was clear to me then, that there was no suggestion that these were to be official hearings, but were unofficial. I have since verified that by reading the press release which announced such hearings.

I had the opportunity to help arrange for a speaker for a teach-in at the University of Minnesota, one of the great universities of this country, and I was in touch with the Department of State to gain from them a spokesman for the administration's point of view.

It is my belief that these teach-ins, these hearings, and every other forum in this country which provide for a discussion of an issue as crucial as that of Vietnam deserve our support and do promote the public interest.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I serve with my colleague from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He is one of the hard-working effective members of that committee. He has demonstrated on that committee a very deep and genuine concern for the welfare of the American people and for their Government.

I am glad to associate myself with the efforts which he has made to try to inform himself more completely about the views of his constituents on Vietnam and in promoting a broader public dis-

cussion of the policy alternatives which continue to confront this Nation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

(Mr. RYAN (at the request of Mr. FRASER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] in his remarks on the importance of unofficial congressional hearings on the importance of unofficial congressional hearings on the Vietnam situation. It is unfortunate that public debate should ever become the casualty of war. It is alarming that debate should ever be stifled because views expressed differ from official governmental policy.

The Congress has yet to undertake a full-scale discussion of the American military and political role in Vietnam. Nonetheless, decisions are made every day that touch the life of every American family. Congressmen need, and the American people deserve, all the illumination that can be brought to bear on the issues.

The hearings I held on August 12 and 13 in New York City were designed to do just that. Panels were balanced with witnesses who presented various points of view—some in support of and some in opposition—to administration policy. Informed citizens exchanged views and debated the issues in a free and open forum.

To label such hearings crackpot or the participants propagandists is to cloud the importance of what was said. It is to divert attention away from the debate by the most tactless name-calling.

I am shocked that any Member of Congress would attack another Member for encouraging this kind of public discussion and impugn his motives. Certainly the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] is owed a public apology.

People in a democracy bear the responsibility of being attentive at all times to decisions and events which shape their lives. Quiescence is never the duty of a citizen. A silent democracy is in fact, a dangerous democracy. Informed public discussion, on the other hand, is a sign of a vital citizenry. I for one have no fears of citizens speaking out.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, there is an honest difference of opinion as to the wisdom of these teach-ins and I subscribe totally to the fact that there is an honest difference of opinion, and also to the wisdom of having broadcast in the country a program of informal so-called hearings.

Again, I subscribe to that fact, that there is an honest difference of opinion, but I have known the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] for some 10 years and his loyalty, his integrity, and his patriotism is unquestioned.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks which were made and which I have read in the RECORD certainly were ill-advised and in-

August 16, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

temperate. The gentleman from New York is a sincere Representative who has been overwhelmingly elected from his district. With respect to those remarks I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], "I am with you and I would hope that the RECORD would some day be adjusted and that they would be withdrawn."

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. ROSENTHAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

## THE LOS ANGELES SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. HANSEN of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today with a deep feeling of apprehension.

The events of the last few days in Los Angeles, Chicago, and other parts of the country—but especially in Los Angeles and southern California—are enough to make one's blood run cold. Here we have seen rioting conducted to such an extent that it can only be called armed insurrection. Here we have seen armed thugs running rampant in the streets burning, pillaging, and killing.

I received a telephone call yesterday from a constituent who is now in Los Angeles. He described to me the hell and horror of that city during the past few days and said, "This isn't America."

I include at this point in my remarks three newspaper clippings—the first a short article from the Wall Street Journal of this date giving the current status in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Springfield, Mass.; and two from the Washington Post of August 14 describing conditions in Los Angeles and Chicago:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 16, 1965]

Los Angeles rioters were driven from the streets by authorities.

Looting and arson decreased in the city's Negro ghetto on the fifth day of disorders, but sniper fire increased. Firemen and police were favorite targets, and some cars on a busy freeway were fired upon. A Negro looting a liquor store was killed by police early yesterday, bringing the death toll to 31, all but 4 of them Negroes. The riots left 762 injured and 2,334 in jail; fire damage was put at \$175 million with unestimated millions in looting losses.

A curfew was extended by California Governor Brown after police and National Guardsmen had seized control from the rioters Saturday night. Security forces sealed off a 42-square-mile area so tightly that residents couldn't get out to buy food. Most of the grocery stores in the area had been burned and looted.

President Johnson expressed a sense of national relief as order was being restored "to the frightened streets" of Los Angeles. He said resort to terror takes from the Negro "the very weapons with which he is achieving his own emancipation."

Chicago police arrested 46 persons Saturday night and early yesterday as violence

resumed sporadically on the West Side. Rioting began Thursday night when a firetruck killed a Negro woman. In Springfield, Mass., calm prevailed after a civil rights demonstration in which 44 persons were arrested early yesterday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 14, 1965]

## ADVERTISING SALESMAN RECALLS TERROR OF LOS ANGELES RIOTING

(Note.—Robert Richardson, 24, a Negro, is an advertising salesman for the Los Angeles Times. He witnessed rioting in South Los Angeles for nearly 8 hours Thursday night.)

(By Robert Richardson)

Los Angeles, August 13.—It was the most terrifying thing I've ever seen in my life. I went along with the mobs—watching, listening.

It's a wonder anyone with white skin got out of there alive.

I saw people with guns. The cry went up several times—"Let's go to Lynwood" (an all-white neighborhood) whenever there weren't enough whites around.

Every time a car with whites in it entered the area, the word spread like lightning down the street:

"Here comes 'Whitey'—get him."

The older people would stand in the background, egging on the teenagers and the people in their early twenties. Then the young men and women would rush in and pull people from their cars and beat them and try to set fire to their cars.

One white couple, in their sixties, happened to be driving along before the blockades were put up. They were beaten and kicked until their faces, hands, and clothing were bloody. I thought they were going to be killed. How they survived I don't know. Those not hitting and kicking the couple were standing there shouting "Kill! Kill!"

Finally, they turned them loose. An ambulance was called, and they were taken away.

Two white men ducked when rocks bombarded their car. When they ducked, the car hit a car with Negroes.

They were beaten so badly one man's eye was hanging out of the socket. Some Negro ministers made their way through the crowd and carried both men into an apartment building and called an ambulance.

The crowd called the ministers hypocrites. They cursed them and spit on them. Some Negro officers tried to disperse the crowd, but they were jeered at, sworn at, called traitors and stoned.

The Negro officers were given a worse time than the white officers.

Light-skinned Negroes such as myself were targets of rocks and bottles until someone standing nearby would shout, "He's blood," or "he's a brother—lay off."

As some areas were blockaded during the night, the mobs would move outside, looking for more cars with whites. When there were no white cars, they started throwing rocks and bottles at Negro cars. Then near midnight, they began looting stores owned by whites.

Everybody got in the looting—children, grownups, old men and women, breaking windows and going into stores.

Then everybody started drinking—even little kids 8 or 9 years old. That's when the cry started, "Let's go where 'Whitey' lives." That's when I began to see guns.

I believe the mobs would have moved into white neighborhoods, but it was getting late, and many of them had to go to work this morning.

But some said, "Wait till tonight and Saturday. We'll really roll over the weekend. We'll really get 'Whitey' then."

They knew they had the upper hand. They

seemed to sense that not the police nor anyone else could stop them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 14, 1965]

## MOB SLASHES POLICEMAN IN NEW CHICAGO OUTBURST

CHICAGO, August 13.—A crowd of Negroes attacked and slashed a white policeman tonight as he drove to work through a racially troubled West Side neighborhood.

Blood streamed from face cuts onto his civilian clothes as other policemen led him through a shoving, shouting crowd of about 200 Negroes. He was identified as Robert Wiens, 25.

A uniformed policeman was reported to have been knocked unconscious when a bottele sailed through the window of his squad car and hit him on the head. His identity was not immediately known.

The attack on Wiens took place 1 block from a civil rights rally sponsored by ACT, a civil rights group. The rally swelled to about 300 after the attack on Wiens.

The all-Negro crowd at the rally shouted "revenge" and "fight" as ACT leader Lawrence Landry exhorted them: "You are misused in a white-controlled society." Landry's speech did not make a direct call to violence.

During the demonstration, 2 dozen crowd members marched into the intersection of Wilcox Avenue and Pulaski Road, where they waved signs, stopping traffic for 5 minutes.

No arrests were made immediately.

At one point, a segment of the crowd surged several blocks down the street to the Goldblatt Bros. Department Store, where they shouted obscenities against "the white man's store" and attempted to break in. Police from six nearby squad cars quelled the attempt in minutes.

A group of about 15, mostly teenagers and including girls, broke windows of the store.

Earlier, city officials suspended three firemen and began an inquiry after a fire truck accident killed a woman bystander and provoked a racial demonstration last night.

Desegregation leaders had attributed some of the bitter feeling to the absence of Negro firemen in the station at 4000 West Wilcox Street, a predominantly Negro neighborhood.

Fire Commissioner Robert J. Quinn shifted Engine Co. 12, consisting of 18 Negro firemen and 1 white captain, into the Wilcox Street Station to replace Truck Co. No. 26. A spokesman at the station said the move was made because company 26's truck was damaged in last night's incident and was undergoing repairs.

Civil disobedience such as the current riots in Chicago and Los Angeles are doing much to harm legitimate Negro goals.

The triggering incident in Chicago, a Negro woman accidentally killed by a firetruck, certainly cannot be called trivial. But the resultant explosion of racial violence was out of all proportion to the cause. Also, the firetruck was responding to a false alarm in a Negro neighborhood, and the race of the person who set the alarm can only be conjectured.

The violent and devastating riots in Los Angeles are inexcusable. They were triggered by the arrest of a Negro youth on suspicion of drunken driving, and I would rather imagine that Los Angeles police blotters of the same day showed a number of arrests of whites on similar charges without any riots.

August 16, 1965

I highly commend responsible Negroes in these critical areas who are trying to bring order out of chaos despite the fact that, in many cases, they are being subjected to greater abuse than that suffered by most whites.

In this connection, I note that Nobel Peace Prize winner, Dr. Martin Luther King, is currently planning on going to Hanoi to talk peace with Ho Chi-minh. Perhaps, before Dr. King attempts any self-appointed international peace assignments, he should stop off in Chicago, Los Angeles, and other critical areas of the Nation. In my opinion, Dr. King and other recognized leaders of this Nation's civil rights movement are obligated to help quell these insurrections which are the inevitable result of pyramiding violations of the law which have been occurring in scores of previous demonstrations.

Mr. Speaker, there is great fear among our people. Where will this lawlessness strike next?

Those with grievances have no business rioting in the streets, destroying lives and property. They, like everyone else, have constitutional recourse to the courts and to lawmaking bodies if their rights have been abridged in any way. This kind of violence can only drive races in this country into armed camps. It would seem to me fundamental that any person or group of persons demanding full privileges of citizenship should assume at least some of the basic responsibilities of that citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, our leaders must not give comfort to lawless behavior. Our legislators are entrusted to pass good legislation. Our people are responsible for selection of good leaders, and to honor and obey the law. These are the only conditions under which domestic peace and security can exist. This is rule by law. This is the American way.

Let us all join in responsible effort to end prejudice, hatred, and violence within this country. Let us never, irrespective of our racial heritage, forget that our Constitution is not only color blind, but it recognizes the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Our system is the last best hope on earth for mankind—let us not fail those who have paid dearly to entrust its blessing to us.

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPEARS UNWILLING TO STRIP RIGHT TO VOTE FROM TWO MAJOR POWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the United States took a painful step at the United Nations today and nobody seems entirely happy about it. We are involved in some rather painful business in Vietnam and no one is entirely happy about that either. But, as we in this Chamber are well aware, working constructively with reality is seldom easy.

The realities facing the administration in its dealings with the constitutional-financial crisis in the United Nations General Assembly are simple, clearcut, and obvious:

Majority sentiment in the General Assembly appears to be unwilling to strip from two major powers the right to vote because they have refused to pay assessments for major activities which they do not wish to support. This unwillingness stems from the simple but genuine fear on the part of many members that to do so would split the United Nations apart, leaving them adrift alone in a very troubled sea.

At the same time, the members of the General Assembly cannot bring themselves to sign away, by legislative act, their only real power: the power under the Charter to assess its membership collectively for activities approved by a majority of the member states. And this is what, in effect, they would be doing if they voted formally not to apply the sanctions of article 19 to the Soviet Union and France, the principal delinquents.

For almost a year now, the General Assembly has been like a sick man forced to lie in a hospital bed, unable to do much other than think about his own weakness. And during that time, without a forum for orderly dialog among nations, we have seen what we call "the world situation" deteriorate. Examples? Today's morning newspaper lists a few: Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Kashmir, rumors of a possible nuclear test by Indonesia who is at odds with her neighbor Malaysia, Cyprus. Plain commonsense dictates that the United States ensure the availability of every instrumentality possible to channel the energies of a restless family of nations into paths leading away from, not toward, cahos and disaster. The General Assembly may not be as strong as it thought it was a year ago, but at least the statesmanlike move today by the U.S. delegation should help get it out of the hospital and onto its feet where it can tower collectively over the misadventures of its membership.

There has been a lot of talk over the past few months, and there will undoubtedly be a lot more in the next few days, about mistakes and defeat. I would suggest that the cardinal mistake was that the General Assembly misjudged its maturity. It moved decisively in the name of its collective membership to meet threats to the peace, trusting in the collective responsibility of that membership to support its initiatives. It was only after deep commitment that it discovered that some of those members wanted out, even though they had acquiesced and in some cases voted for the major peacekeeping undertakings in the Congo and in the Middle East.

By its unwillingness now to insist that these delinquent members pay their fair share of these operations, the General Assembly has admitted to its limitations as a corporate body of nations, and accepted that it will not require major powers to shoulder the greater burden of

financing of major activities they do not wish to support. This does not mean that future such activities will die unborn. On the contrary, they can be financed by those nations principally interested and concerned.

As Ambassador Goldberg said today, however, the United States considers such an attitude equally applicable to itself. Thus, although he stressed the firmness of U.S. support for the integrity of the regular budget of the United Nations, our new representative served notice that this country reserved the right to hold back its support of questionable major activities which an irresponsible majority might attempt to launch in the future.

As for the word "defeat," I would suggest that it applies really to the General Assembly's battle with itself. The United States could be Jiminy Cricket for only so long. The World Court could advise but once. After that, it was up to the General Assembly collectively to decide the extent of the role as an international deliberating and deciding body it could actually play in the world as it is today.

The task for the United States now is exactly as it has been since the signing of the charter 20 years ago in 1945. It is to work to bring to the community of nations through our voice in the United Nations the ideals and goals and belief in the rights of man which have motivated us as a nation for almost 200 years. It is at the same time, to use the United Nations to help keep chaos and irresponsibility from keeping us and other peaceloving nations from realizing the goals we seek.

I do not view our position as a backdown. I view it as a mature demonstration of our desire not to dissolve the U.N. and leave the United Nations building as an empty monument to the futility of man's search for peace. The central problem in the world today is in the perilous posture of world peace in Vietnam. The best hope for a termination of that war is in the United Nations.

In this light it would not only be immature but adverse to our national interest and toward world peace to force a dissolution of the United Nations by a confrontation with the Soviet Union on a legal interpretation of one's financial obligation.

On the Great Seal of the United States the American eagle holds in one of its talons an olive branch and in the other arrows. Our history has demonstrated that there is a time for the arrows and a time for the olive branch. The necessity to use the arrows is unfortunate and yet in Vietnam today that necessity continues to exist. At the United Nations today we are relying more on the olive branch in order to prevent the stalemate and possible dissolution of the United Nations because we are essentially interested in peace and the United Nations still remains man's best hope for peace. Perhaps the United Nations will never realize a world of total agreement but it could realize a world at peace living by the rule of law. This

August 16, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

wicked fangs bared much of the time. He looked pitifully small against the large gray wolves.

As he watched, Uyatorna concluded that the fate of the wolverine was a foregone conclusion. It was just a matter of time. How could a small animal like him ever hoped to pit its small body, although powerful to be sure, against the great bulk of the savage wolves?

The hunter was amazed at the show of courage of the small animal. He was not about to cower away leaving the caribou he had claimed for himself. He had apparently killed it himself because of the apparent savagery of the attack. The throat of the caribou had all but been torn away.

## THE TIGHTENING CIRCLE

Spellbound and with tingling expectancy, Uyatorna watched the ever-tightening circle of wolves around the hapless and courageous wolverine. It seemed to him that it was a maneuver designed to unnerve the doughty little animal.

The maneuver was deadly, calculated—that showed a latent and lethal ferocity. Uyatorna felt a pang of pity for the wolverine. Should he intervene? He decided against it. The animals were working themselves into a pitch of fury and if he revealed himself, there was a good chance that they would turn on him.

The wolverine no longer circled around the dead caribou. He settled on the side where the dead animal's legs lay sprawled. Each of the wolves were now about 15 feet from the object of their prey. They began to emit low, threatening growls, not all at once but by staggered turns. This forced the wolverine to turn its body in different directions in quick succession.

Still the wolves edged forward shrinking the deadly ring. Suddenly one of them, apparently the leader, snarled wickedly, baring its fangs. The others followed, again in staggered turns. The wolverine sprung around swiftly with hissing growls—fangs bared.

The series of snarls increased. The wolves were apparently trying to confuse their prey that was beginning to spin around to his left and right by turns. He was expecting attack from any quarter any moment.

## THE DEADLY SCENE

Uyatorna watched in dreadful fascination. The scene below him was a deadly one where each animal would ask no quarter nor would it expect any. At least one of them would be dead. The hunter no longer doubted in his mind that one of the dead would be the wolverine.

"Amaqut makoa tuqutiqneagii munna qaveoraaq." ("These wolves will surely kill the little wolverine") Uyatorna thought.

The snarls of the wolves continued. They began to make feinting moves toward the wolverine. Uyatorna was amazed at the little animal. He seemed to be aware of each feint. He showed great agility and he seemed ready to meet each one. What if the wolves attacked all at once in a mass of collective fury? What chance has he got?

## THE ATTACK

Even as he wondered, one of the wolves attacked a split second before the others. The wolverine met it in a surprising and unorthodox manner. The little animal ducked and appeared to go under the wolf. At that instant there was a sickening, grinding snap of bone. In a lightning-fast counter, the wolverine had gone for the left hind leg of the attacker and closed his powerful jaws on the thigh and bone.

The victim yowled with pain and twisted violently in the air and fell down hard on the front quarters of one of the attacking wolves, confusing it. The wounded wolf's lungs hung loosely—grotesquely—blood squirted from it in a series of jets.

The little brown and cream haired animal took advantage instantly and snapped its jaws on the small of the back of the momentarily confused animal and twisted its grip wickedly. The vicious attack apparently did a great damage, because the wolf tried to flee all but dragging its hind quarters.

The two remaining wolves made a savage attack on the wolverine, momentarily knocking him off balance. The little animal regained his footing while one wolf gripped him on the neck. The other one went for his flanks.

The powerful little carnivore, apparently worrying about his flanks, made a quick, twisting motion. An instant later his heavily muscled right foreleg whipped and caught the wolf at his flanks on the shoulder with his sharp nails and paw. An exposed flesh suddenly appeared as the skin flapped down from the wound.

The injured wolf backed away limping but the one at his neck held on tenaciously—wickedly. The wolverine was in trouble. He made a series of quick motions and suddenly there was a terrible crunch of bones. The little animal had caught his remaining attacker by the knee of its right foot and crushed it with his powerful jaws.

The wolf let out a howling scream as it released its hold on the neck of the wolverine. This is what the latter wanted. He turned aggressor in an instant and snapped his powerful jaws on the neck of his enemy partly from under and side.

## THE ENRAGED WOLVERINE

Working for a leverage, the enraged wolverine braced himself and made a pulling and twisting motion. The body of the huge wolf whipped partly in the air. Its neck snapped and it fell dead—it's head in a gruesome and unnatural position.

## THE CARNAGE

The little animal had emerged victorious against what seemed impossible odds. He looked around and then made a circle surveying the carnage and the evidence of it he had created. The terrible death-dealing look remained in his eyes. He bared his fangs from time to time as he emitted half hissing growls. There was froth at the corners of his mouth.

Except for his murderous eyes and wicked fangs, the wolverine looked anything but a lethal killer to Uyatorna. He ambled along clumsily as if he didn't possess any agility and strength. It was all there along with one of the most powerful jaws possessed by any animal.

The wolverine was apparently trying to locate the trail left by the wolf that had left the scene of the fray dragging its hind quarters. He seems to have picked up the scent and proceeded to trail it.

"AYIYAA," shouted Uyatorna. "Little wolverine, you have done quite enough. I will kill that wolf for you."

As he shouted, the hunter revealed himself above the rock formation. The animal saw him instantly and bristled, baring his fangs. Man was another sort of an enemy and the wolverine instinctively withdrew and ambled away.

Uyatorna walked around the rock and began to pursue the wounded wolf. When he came upon it, he shot an arrow through its heart. He didn't bother to go after the one with a severed artery on its hind leg. It had gone over a low rise and disappeared.

"If he hasn't bled to death by now, he will in a short time," Uyatorna voiced his thought.

The one with the shoulder wound had run away with a bad limp and it was nowhere to be seen.

## HEALTHY CARIBOU

Uyatorna went back to the dead caribou and the wolf. He was surprised that it was

a yearling bull and a healthy one except for a recent injury to the right eye. It had been badly torn into uselessness. It had probably suffered an unexpected accident and fell behind a herd when the wolves apparently took pursuit.

The wolverine might have been in a lucky position and beaten the wolves to the attack. Uyatorna concluded that it had attacked the caribou from the blind side and this unexpected incident had created the deadly drama which the hunter witnessed in spellbound fascination.

The man skinned the caribou and cut out choice pieces of meat and wrapped them in the skin.

The wolverine had taken a position at a distance just beyond effective arrow range from the man. Uyatorna could have shot the animal if he wished because it had been within perfect range.

He didn't however, because he had come to admire the little animal's invincible courage under what seemed to be the most deadly and impossible odds. The wolverine was licking its wounds and watching Uyatorna as he worked around the carcass.

The hunter cut out a piece of caribou meat and walked part way toward the animal.

"Uvah, qaveoraaq, tutumik neqearaqin." ("Here, little wolverine, eat a piece of caribou meat,") he shouted. He threw the morsel toward the fierce little carnivore. As the hunter returned to the carcass, the animal edged toward the piece of meat and ate it.

## THE WINDFALL

As he finished skinning the dead wolf, Uyatorna turned to the wolverine and shouted, "Little wolverine, now you can have all the caribou meat you want."

He skinned the one he had shot through the heart and then followed the bloody trail of the third one. He found it about a quarter of a mile where it had bled to death.

As he skinned it, Uyatorna observed, "These were young grown wolves and they were reckless. The one that got away will never forget the terrible lesson he learned today."

As he started home with the load of caribou meat and skin and three wolf pelts, Uyatorna chuckled:

"Amasuk will never believe me when I tell her how I got all these animals."

*Fe (the) mind ale*  
MINNESOTA POLL SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Johnson's policies in Vietnam have brought forth loud criticism from a vocal minority, a minority which claims that these policies do not have the support of the American people. But I am proud to report that, according to a recent poll by the Minneapolis Tribune, a strong majority of Minnesotans do stand behind the President and the action he has taken in meeting this very difficult problem.

President Johnson has declared that we must support the people of Vietnam and their efforts to determine their own destiny in the face of Communist aggression. Fifty-eight percent of Minnesotans clearly support this policy, compared to only 21 percent who oppose it. An even greater majority, 77 percent, feel that the President's explanation of the reasons for our commitment is a convincing one. And 58 percent of the people of my State recognize the neces-

19768

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 16, 1965

sity of sending more American troops to Vietnam at this time.

Results of the poll also indicate strong support for the President's efforts to find an alternative to war, his efforts to reach a peaceful settlement through negotiations which our Communist adversaries still refuse to participate in.

Mr. President, I am proud that the people of my State are so clearly in support of President Johnson's policies in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the Minnesota poll of August 8, 1965, be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 8, 1965]

## FIFTY-EIGHT PERCENT APPROVE SENDING OF TROOPS TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Most Minnesotans (58 percent) support U.S. policy of sending more troops to battle in South Vietnam, a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll indicates.

Thirty-one percent of the men and women questioned in home interviews disapprove of enlarging the Nation's role in Vietnam, as is being done by the Johnson administration.

The rest of the people are undecided or have special opinions to offer.

Approval is based mainly on the feeling that "we have committed ourselves and have got to end the war as soon as possible" or that U.S. involvement in the war needs to be increased to stop communism.

Such endorsements often are expressed reluctantly in the survey. "I don't like the idea, but we have to do it," a Bloomington housewife said.

A farmer from Otter Tail County put it this way: "I guess we got to finish what we started, but we're not wanted over there. It's just like it was in Korea, all these boys killed and no real answer for it."

Frustration over the difficult war in southeast Asia and dismay over losing American lives there are the main factors which cause Minnesotans to disapprove of sending more troops.

What is expressed in the survey is a close approximation of how the general public in the State reacts. That's because the 600 people who were interviewed only 2 weeks ago are an accurate model of the adult population.

They reveal uncertainty about U.S. participation over a decade in the affairs of Vietnam, although a majority of people (58 percent) think our reasons for helping South Vietnam are sound.

The public is more in agreement when it comes to accepting President Johnson's explanation for the United States being in South Vietnam; 77 percent say a paraphrase of Mr. Johnson's remarks contain "good" reasoning.

People were asked early in their interviews: "Let's consider southeast Asia for a moment. The United States has been helping South Vietnam since 1954. Do you think the reasons for our support are sound or not sound?"

The replies:

|                       |    |
|-----------------------|----|
| Reasons are sound     | 58 |
| Reasons are not sound | 21 |
| Other answers         | 3  |
| No opinion            | 18 |

Total 100

Interviewers then changed the subject and asked several questions on other topics, a conversational maneuver that was specified on their question forms.

That interlude afforded people a chance

not to feel locked into their previous opinions when they were asked:

"President Johnson has said that the United States is in South Vietnam to help the people there secure their independence and to show the world we keep our promises to fight for freedom. Do you think those are good reasons or poor reasons for being in South Vietnam?"

|               | Percent |
|---------------|---------|
| Good reasons  | 77      |
| Poor reasons  | 14      |
| Other answers | 3       |
| No opinion    | 6       |
| Total         | 100     |

Almost half of the people (47 percent) who said on the earlier question that our participation in Vietnamese affairs was based on unsound principles thought the President's explanation was good.

Here is a comparison of the two sets of responses with the qualified answers and no opinion count not shown:

|                                   | (In percent)       |           |                  |      |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|------|
|                                   | U.S. participation |           | L.B.J.'s reasons |      |
|                                   | Sound              | Not sound | Good             | Poor |
| All adults                        | 58                 | 21        | 77               | 14   |
| Men                               | 62                 | 24        | 75               | 16   |
| Women                             | 54                 | 19        | 78               | 12   |
| Adults with grade school training | 44                 | 29        | 71               | 16   |
| High school                       | 59                 | 19        | 81               | 11   |
| College                           | 73                 | 17        | 75               | 16   |
| Democratic-Farmer-Laborites       | 63                 | 19        | 83               | 11   |
| Republicans                       | 58                 | 27        | 74               | 16   |
| Independents                      | 62                 | 21        | 70               | 16   |

The next question was: "We now have 70,000 men in Vietnam. The U.S. ground forces will be increased to 150,000 troops, many of whom will be taking an active part in the fighting. Do you approve or disapprove of our playing a larger role in the Vietnam struggle?

|              | (In percent) |             |                      |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|
|              | Approve      | Dis-approve | Other and no opinion |
| All adults   | 58           | 31          | 11                   |
| Men          | 67           | 25          | 8                    |
| Women        | 50           | 36          | 14                   |
| Grade school | 54           | 31          | 15                   |
| High school  | 57           | 34          | 9                    |
| College      | 66           | 25          | 9                    |
| DFLers       | 67           | 26          | 7                    |
| Republicans  | 55           | 34          | 11                   |
| Independents | 49           | 37          | 14                   |

Each person who had an opinion was asked why they approved or disapproved. These are their answers, the percentages being expressed in terms of all people interviewed:

Approval:

|   |    |
|---|----|
| We committed ourselves and have got to follow through, must end war as soon as possible | 40 |
| Must stop communism   | 18 |
| Must keep promise to South Vietnam  | 4  |
| Other answers   | 3  |

Disapproval:

|   |    |
|---|----|
| They don't want our help and we don't belong; United States can't win anyway      | 5  |
| Nothing is accomplished, we have done enough there, should pull out or end it now | 5  |
| We are losing too many lives  | 5  |
| Must be another solution, the U.N. should help                                    | 5  |
| Other answers   | 11 |

As an example, the above table indicates that 40 percent of all the people interviewed approve of sending more troops to Vietnam because we have commitment to follow through. Many persons supplied more than one reason for their approval or disapproval.

## CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF KALAUPAPA SETTLEMENT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, 100 years ago a tiny settlement was established on the island of Molokai in the Hawaiian Kingdom for the victims of leprosy, now known as Hansen's disease.

Last week a 3-day centennial observance was held at the isolated settlement. Guests from the outside world were invited by the nearly 200 active and inactive patients for a luau—Hawaiian feast—and a display of crafts made there.

It is difficult to imagine now the pathetic condition of those who were sent to the settlement at Kalaupapa in the early years. Into this valley of death and despair came Father Damien, who ministered to the afflicted until he himself succumbed to the disease.

The dramatic story of the Kalaupapa settlement and the heroic sacrifice of Father Damien has been retold on this centennial occasion in an article in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of August 11, 1965. Ably written by Tom Kaser, the article describes the settlement as it was and as it is today.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KALAUPAPA MARKS A CENTURY OF ISOLATION  
(By Tom Kaser)

KALAUPAPA, MOLOKAI.—You can't help but feel a little humble at this place, especially when you consider its geography and its history.

Kalaupapa, located on a peninsula at the foot of cliffs on Molokai's rugged north coast, is one of only three centers for the treatment of Hansen's disease (leprosy) in the United States today.

Hale Mohalu, in Pearl City, and a U.S. Public Health Service hospital in Carville, La., are the only other institutions in the country that exclusively treat communicable or "active" cases of Hansen's disease.

It is possible that leprosy, as it was known before 1874, was diagnosed in the Hawaiian Islands as early as 1823, when a Protestant missionary wrote in his journal that "cases of ophthalmic scrofula and elephantiasis" were on the increase.

The first officially recorded case of leprosy in Hawaii was in 1853, and by the late 1850's the disease had spread to almost epidemic proportions.

King Kamehameha V finally declared, in January 1865, that those afflicted with leprosy must be isolated, and the site chosen by the board of health was a peninsula on the north coast of Molokai.

For \$1,800, the board bought most of the land on the peninsula, including from 15 to 20 houses and rights to use nearby Wai-kolu and Wai-nina Valleys.

Nine men and three women were on the first boat that arrived at the peninsula, on January 6, 1866. Part of the group consisted of kokus or helpers. Also included was a health department superintendent, but neither he nor several of his successors spoke Hawaiian.

whom they can make their case. I refer to section 16, amending section 209 (e) of the act. It is an amendment I had the honor to offer.

I call attention also to an amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], which he described in his very interesting address, making the National Advisory Council under the act really meaningful.

I call attention also to a very important amendment, sponsored by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], with respect to the possibility of political manipulation, which extends the political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act, now applicable only to State and local officials operating under the act, also to private persons whose salaries are paid predominantly by the Federal funds under the Antipoverty Act.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] offered an amendment specifically including consumer education, which is a crucial lack among the poor, in the list of areas which community action programs are encouraged to cover.

I call attention to another amendment which I had the honor to propose, under which the public is given a greater degree of information on the local level than the House provided. It is found in section 9 of the bill amending section 202(a)(5) of the act. It permits public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, as well as opening books and records of a participating agency to the light of day of the press, radio, television, and other agencies of public information, which can zero in on what is being done in the programs. This is the best cathartic I know of to deal with excesses and inequities.

Another amendment which I had the honor to offer calls for continuous consultation with State antipoverty agencies at every stage of the planning and conduct of community action programs, and is to be found in section 14 of the bill amending section 209(a) of the act. Too often, the office in Washington has announced approval of programs which the States have not seen before, this is clearly unreasonable in those States which are fully cooperating in the anti-poverty effort.

We have not at all done what we ought to do about the right of a Governor to veto a proposed program. I feel that we made a great mistake in wiping out altogether the provision for a Governor's veto. It was done by a close vote in the committee; the vote was 8 to 7. We should have left in the bill an effective procedure, under a modified version of the House provision. A Governor should be given the opportunity to express his disapproval, as he has every right to do. If the Director wishes to override him, there should be a public hearing, which would put the Director of OEO in Washington to his proof. In short, the Governor should not be permitted to kill a program, but neither should his disapproval stand if the Director, in the court of public opinion, can prove his case.

That subject will probably be the most serious one we shall have to deal with tomorrow and the next day in consider-

ing additional amendments with respect to this legislation.

My colleagues, who also proceeded on such amendments in the committee, will be offering cuts in the authorizations of funds. Whether or not I favor such cuts, I believe the Senate should give them serious attention, because it is true we must not be profligate if there is no opportunity to retain control over the program.

In addition, there are other amendments with which we shall have to deal.

Finally, as I announced last week during consideration of the conference report on the Peace Corps, it is my intention to offer an amendment—and this will be my final effort in this regard—to confine the Director of the antipoverty program, Sargent Shriver, to one job, namely, his direction of the antipoverty program. I feel that this subject should not be labored unduly, but I feel we must decide it in respect of how we want this poverty program to operate.

Senators should bear in mind, if we get into a discussion—and there are many openings for one—in which it is found that the administration of the program was at fault, that we should understand that we had an opportunity to correct the situation, and that we either did or did not do it in an advised way. I have grave concern as to the propriety and wisdom of continuing to let Sargent Shriver—an excellent public servant—carry both jobs. I deeply feel that it will result in a serious diminution of capability in bringing about success in both jobs—and most likely it will be felt most in the antipoverty program.

I therefore hope very much that the Senate will express itself firmly and finally on that subject. I shall be prepared to argue the question of constitutionality of such action taken by the Senate, as I believe it is entirely constitutional and entirely in accordance with the powers and authority of the Senate—indeed, its duty—in this matter.

I look forward, therefore, to disposition of the amendments and the bill in the spirit which I have described, the spirit of being very much for the war on poverty, and of understanding the pitfalls which are involved and therefore endeavoring, by every means open to us, to avoid them.

#### *Thurmond* ATTACK ON REPRESENTATIVE MENDEL RIVERS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, earlier in the day, a Member of this body launched an unbridled attack on the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, Representative of the First Congressional District of South Carolina. The subject of the attack on Representative Rivers was a report of a speech made by him in Hartford, Conn., on August 11, 1965. Representative Rivers was quoted as saying: "I will insist on victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable." He is further reported to have stated "that Americans must be prepared to make the decision to attack Mao Tse-tung's home-

land if Mao's forces start moving." The Representative asked rhetorically: "Should we use our atomic power to wipe out Red China's atomic capabilities?" He then stated, "We must get ready to do this very thing if we want to stop Red China."

These remarks were characterized on the Senate floor as "so un-American as to be abhorrent."

Mr. President, neither the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee nor his remarks need defense by me. Representative RIVERS has long years of experience in the field of military affairs from his dedicated service on the House Armed Services Committee. I should like to point out that his independent and objective views have caused confrontation with far more experienced officials, including even the Secretary of Defense. I should also like to point out, however, that the distinguished chairman has been dealing with military affairs firsthand, and from a responsible position, far longer than the Secretary of Defense, not to mention his Johnny-come-lately critics.

In the final analysis, the American people must judge what is and what is not un-American. The President has stated categorically that we are engaged in a war in Vietnam. Representative RIVERS states that anything short of victory in this war would be treason, and his other remarks merely expressed the hard realities of what may be necessary to achieve that victory. I am sure that Representative RIVERS is satisfied, as I am, to leave it to the judgment of the American people as to which is un-American—victory in the war, or appeasement of the enemy.

#### SUPPORT FOR U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a friend of the American merchant marine, I am extremely interested in the work of the Presidential Task Force on Merchant Marine Policy, which is headed by Alan S. Boyd, Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

All the reports which have come to my attention indicate that this task force is conducting a most thorough investigation of the many and complex aspects of merchant marine policy. All of us who are concerned with this vital area await its recommendations.

This past weekend, I submitted to the task force an outline of my own views on U.S. merchant marine policy. Representing as I do the great State of Maryland, which contains the second leading port in the Nation, Baltimore, I have gained some experience in the problems of the maritime industry. This experience has led me to certain conclusions about our merchant marine policy. I submitted these conclusions to the Presidential Task Force for their consideration. I would like to review these policy suggestions in the Senate today.

Before I make any suggestions about the U.S. merchant marine policy, however, I would like to discuss briefly some of the reasons why I believe that a vigorous and progressive policy is necessary.

August 16, 1965

The declaration of policy of the merchant Marine Act of 1936 set forth the objectives of the Congress. Since these objectives have since been obscured and, in some instances, ignored, I would like to quote from this declaration of policy:

It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

I believe that these are worthy objectives. From the point of view of national defense, there is no question that a large and efficient merchant marine, coupled with a healthy shipbuilding and ship repair industry, can make a major contribution to our national security. Vessels are needed for troop transport. The entire First Cavalry Division embarked for Vietnam last week by ship. They are needed for supply functions as well. Some 600 ships were required to supply American troops in Korea, and the present situation in southeast Asia has demonstrated the continuing need for such vessels. The shipyards, both naval and private, must also be ready, to activate and repair vessels for service in the national defense. The conclusion of the Harvard Business School study for the Navy Department in 1945 still holds true today:

The controlling factor in the determination of the characteristics of shipping and shipbuilding activities in the United States in peacetime as well as in wartime is the national security.

The value to U.S. commerce of a healthy merchant marine is equally clear. There will be gains in employment, in returns to the American economy, and in reliability if "a substantial part" of our commerce is carried in U.S. bottoms. This is particularly important in light of persistent balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet today only 9 percent of our foreign commerce moves in American-flag vessels. Norwegian carriers transport twice as much of the American foreign trade as U.S. flagships; Liberia carries three times as much as we do. And even from this poor position, we are losing ground.

These concerns become all the more urgent in view of the rapid buildup of the fleets of other nations, most especially of the Soviet Union. The United States ranks only fourth in the world in number of ships afloat, even discounting the disastrous effects of the current maritime strike. The Soviet Union has already surpassed us in number of ships

in the active fleet, and may shortly exceed us in total tonnage afloat.

While nations like Japan and Norway are engaged in determined efforts to build up their fleets, we are falling farther and farther behind. We now rank no higher than 11th among shipbuilding nations of the world. The United States—the leading trading nation in the world—risks becoming low man on the totem pole of international shipping.

The need, then, is clear. My suggestions fall into four general classifications.

First. Probably most important is the matter of subsidies. The Government pays out nearly \$400 million a year in direct and indirect subsidies to the shipping and shipbuilding industries.

Under normal circumstances, a nation whose economy is based upon free enterprise regards a subsidy system as alien and undesirable. It seems to me, however, that there are certain goals—the ones enumerated in the 1936 act—which can be achieved only through the maintenance of a healthy American shipping and shipbuilding industry. Due to several factors, notably the high standard of living of American workmen, these goals simply cannot be met without Government subsidy. It is for this reason that, although I sympathize with those who dislike the general principle of Government subsidy, I feel that certain forms of subsidy are essential in this case.

Construction subsidies are an important means of insuring the adequacy of the merchant marine and of the shipyards. It seems to me to be advisable to continue the present system of construction differential subsidies to the liner fleet. The U.S. liner fleet is the finest in the world, due in large part to the Government aid program—80 percent of the 20-knot cargo liner vessels in the world have been built and operated in the United States. This part of the program should continue, with up to 55 percent of the construction cost being paid by the Federal Government.

The first Subcommittee of the Maritime Advisory Committee, after long and careful study of U.S. needs, has concluded that a bulk carrier construction aid program is desirable. This has long been my position.

Given the requirement that ships be built in the United States, we must recognize that this country will never acquire an efficient bulk carrier fleet without Government subsidy. And it is most certainly in the national interest that such a fleet of dry bulk carriers be developed.

According to the analysis made by the Presidential Task Force, the average cost of each bulk carrier would be \$11 million, approximately half of it to be paid by the Government. A fleet of 250 vessels, to be built by 1985, has been suggested.

Such a program would add \$169 million to the annual subsidy of nearly \$400 million, at the outset, for a total expenditure of approximately \$570 million.

I do not believe that this is too large a price to pay for the development of a bulk carrier fleet, which can be of in-

estimable value to this country in the future. Moreover, as the Maritime Advisory Subcommittee has pointed out:

Much of the cost will be recouped by the Government through additional revenues.

A substantial portion of every dollar of subsidy will return to the Government in the form of income or corporation tax.

I would not presume to give detailed advice as to the number and design of such vessels, of course. But I believe that subsidy for such construction would be highly appropriate. It would undoubtedly prove to be one of the best investments that this Government could make.

It might prove necessary, once the construction of the new dry bulk carriers is completed, to grant an operating subsidy to this segment of the fleet as well. I would propose, however, that no such action be undertaken until a detailed study of the requirements had been completed. With the modernization of the fleet and the continuation of the cargo preference assistance, the dry bulk carriers might well prove to be self-supporting.

I have already cosponsored in the Senate a bill S. 1858, which would allow the creation of tax-free reserve funds for the construction of new vessels. The enactment of such a proposal would provide construction assistance to the other non-subsidized shippers. The continuation of present trade-in procedures is also to be recommended. Taken together, this construction assistance for liners, dry bulk carriers, and others would provide a well-rounded program of modernization of the U.S. cargo fleet.

Another important area in which Government assistance is given is that of operating subsidies. Due to the high standard of living of American seamen, there appears to be no alternative to continuing operating subsidies, if we are to continue to hire American crews and operate vessels under the American flag. These subsidies must therefore be continued.

It may be noted, however, that a significant increase in construction subsidies, such as I have urged, would produce a much more modern and efficient American fleet. This in turn would reduce the amount of operating subsidy needed.

Second. Another area in which the Government can be of great assistance in promoting a healthy merchant marine is the policy of cargo preference. Public Law 664, enacted in 1954, provides that at least 50 percent of U.S. Government-generated cargo shall be carried in American flag vessels, if such vessels are available at "fair and reasonable rates." Public Resolution 17, enacted in 1934, declares that all agricultural products financed by U.S. loans shall be delivered in U.S. vessels, if they are available. In addition, all military cargoes must be shipped on American flag ships.

Three years ago, the late President Kennedy reaffirmed the importance of this cargo preference, stating in particular that the 50 percent requirement "is a minimum, and it shall be the objective

of each agency to ship a maximum of such cargoes on U.S. flag vessels."

Despite this explicit Presidential order, there have been numerous occasions on which the requirement has not been met.

Rather than detail the instances, I would merely cite the 1962 report of the Commerce Committee on this subject:

All too often, the committee has felt, there has been evidenced in at least several of the administrative departments an apparent desire on the part of those responsible for shipping arrangements to evade the cargo preference requirement whenever opportunity offered.

Close congressional supervision has resulted in some improvement of the situation since then, but American cargo shipping is still in a weak and rapidly deteriorating condition. The temptation for Government agencies to ship in foreign bottoms at lower rates still appears to be strong.

I, therefore, feel that a reaffirmation and extension of the cargo preference policy would be appropriate. The U.S. merchant marine cannot remain healthy without substantial amounts of cargo. The U.S. Government, which is the immediate beneficiary of a strong merchant marine in time of emergency, should be the first to give the American shippers that cargo. I, therefore, propose that 75 percent of this Government's cargo be shipped in American bottoms. I have respectfully urged the task force to make such a recommendation.

In addition, of course, I believe that the Congress should continue to oversee carefully the administration of the cargo preference laws. As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, I will do my utmost to see that all Government agencies comply with these regulations whenever practicable.

The first subcommittee of the Maritime Advisory Committee made a recommendation that not less than 30 percent of all petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States be carried by U.S.-flag tankers, where they are available.

I agree with the subcommittee that such a regulation would not be unduly harsh on petroleum importers, and that it might aid significantly in restoring our tanker fleet to some semblance of strength. At present, American flagships carry only 2.3 percent of the petroleum imports of this country. Surely we can, and should, do much better than that.

In general, I feel that the Government should expand and intensify its efforts to promote shipping in American bottoms. Some of these efforts can be direct: Through an expanded and strictly enforced cargo preference program—the cost of which may be reduced as increasing modernization brings American shipping rates into line with foreign rates.

Other efforts can be indirect: The Maritime Administration's continuing promotion, "for trade or trips, American ships" is an example. Such a dual program, efficiently administered, would greatly strengthen the American merchant marine.

Third. The next general area of maritime policy which I feel deserves attention is labor-management relations. As I told a Senate subcommittee, the labor situation has been chaotic in recent years. I strongly feel that something must be done about this deplorable situation—operating as far as possible within the framework of free collective bargaining.

I concur heartily with what Secretary of Commerce Connor said at the Merchant Marine Academy last week:

In our system of free, competitive enterprise, I would prefer to see a diminishing Government role and an expanding private role in the maritime industry. But so long as the Government is involved—so long, for instance, as the Government is called upon to pay 72 cents or more of every dollar in wages aboard subsidized ships—the voice of the Government must and will be heard.

When the Government and the taxpayers of this country have as big a stake in the maritime industry as they do—to the extent of nearly \$400 million annually—they have a right to expect some stability in labor-management relations, and some continuity in the service for which they are paying a large part of the bills.

I believe that the Government should require a no-strike clause in the labor contracts of all construction and operation which it subsidizes. Only in this manner can some continuity of service be insured.

I would like to make it clear that I am not proposing compulsory arbitration of collective bargaining issues. When a contract comes up for negotiation, there should be free and unimpaired collective bargaining, aided perhaps by Federal mediation if such mediation would assist in preventing a work stoppage.

But once a contract has been agreed upon, issues which arise during the life of the contract should be settled by arbitration—not by strike or by lockout. And I respectfully submit that the Federal Government should make this a prerequisite of any construction or operating subsidy.

Fourth. Lastly, I offer several recommendations which bear on the Government's policies toward the private shipyards of the Nation. I think it should be the general objective of the Government to encourage the growth and continued health of the private shipyards.

This can be accomplished in several ways. I would oppose a total ban on the purchase of any vessels abroad, but I believe that no such purchases in foreign shipyards should be made without careful consultation with the Congress. Twice during the past year, such purchases have been suggested. The general rule—to be reached only under exceptional circumstances—should be that no work which could be done in American yards, thereby fostering a substantial American construction and repair capacity, should be given to foreign yards.

This rule should apply to Defense Department contracts as well as those of the other agencies. Moreover, the requirement that subsidized ships be built in U.S. yards is reasonable and very much in line with the 1936 declaration of policy.

The Defense Department can aid the maintenance of a strong private shipyard industry in another way: By guaranteeing a substantial portion of the naval repair and conversion work to the private yards. The 65/35 provision formerly included in the annual Department of Defense appropriation would be an effective means of guaranteeing a minimum of 35 percent of such work to private yards.

The proposals which I have made would not be without cost to the Federal Government. If adopted, they might raise the present total annual maritime expenditure substantially. But a nation which can afford \$5.2 billion for space, it seems to me, can also afford to spend sufficient funds to insure an adequate merchant marine.

And it would be short-sighted indeed to assume that funds spent to assist the maintenance of our merchant marine are funds lost. Not only will they produce an effective and efficient merchant marine for wartime and peacetime activity, not only will they save the United States substantial amounts of dollars on her international balance of payments, not only will they provide jobs for American seamen and shipyard workers, but they will be paid back to the Government, in large part, in the form of taxes. Thus the additional spending which would be entailed would represent a relatively small but very important investment—one of the best investments, in my judgment, which the Government could make.

In summary, my proposals would involve additional subsidies, increased cargo preference, provisions for labor peace, and placing of work in American shipyards. The cost would not be prohibitive; the results, I believe, would be of great advantage to this Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maryland for the speech he is making. I associate myself with his speech.

I tell the Senator that, as in years gone by, he can find me on exactly the same side that the senior Senator from Maryland is taking.

I believe that the senior Senator from Maryland is unanswerably right, and that the speech he is making is needed. I hope that the Navy and the Defense Department and the White House will take note of his remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. I appreciate the fact that he joins with me and lends his great prestige to the point of view that I am now raising and that he has so long espoused.

*Barry Goldwater*  
VIETNAM FORMER SENATOR  
GOLDWATER'S COLUMN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a column written by a former Member of this body, Barry Goldwater—I believe that most of us still remember him—was published in the New York Herald Tribune for August 15 and in other newspapers

August 16, 1965

which publish Mr. Goldwater's column. While it is highly critical of me, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCREWBALL IDEAS  
(By Barry Goldwater)

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, suggests that there is a rising demand among the American people to impeach President Johnson. He made this astounding announcement recently in the Senate.

Senator MORSE, who is noted for going to any lengths to make a point in favor of his own position, claimed that this is due to the administration's Vietnam policy, which he opposes.

"In my trip across the country," the Oregon Democrat told his colleagues on August 3, "I have been alarmed by the rising denunciation of the President and his administration for their Vietnam policy.

"I have heard the word 'impeach' used more often in the last week than I have heard it since President Truman sacked General MacArthur.

"I have been asked by more people than I would have thought possible if there is not grounds for impeachment of the President, and how the process can be set in motion. I have been advised about petitions that have been circulated and hundreds of people are signing asking for the President's impeachment," he stated.

"Much of this talk stems from objections to a war being undertaken without congressional declaration. Most of these people see the President as waging an executive war in violation of the Constitution. They think the impeachment clauses of the Constitution must apply to such a case."

Senator MORSE accused President Johnson in the same speech of conducting an illegal war in Vietnam. He added:

"In my judgment, we cannot justify the homicides for which the President or Rusk or McNamara or Bundy or Lodge and the rest of them are responsible in conducting an unconstitutional war in South Vietnam."

These statements, coming from a Democrat, raise some interesting questions.

One wonders just who Senator MORSE talked to during his trip across the country. Since all the public opinion polls show the American people overwhelmingly support the President's policy in Vietnam, it must be concluded that the Senator spent his time consulting the intellectual extremists who keep suggesting that the President is "out of control" because he has decided to stand firm against Communist aggression in Asia. It is safe to assume that most Americans never heard the suggestion of impeachment until Senator MORSE cut loose.

What did he expect to accomplish by his remarkable statement?

He carefully says that he was "alarmed" by what he heard. But it is important to note that his concern did not prevent him from giving the widest possible circulation to a ridiculous suggestion of removing the President.

Senator MORSE also coupled his comments with a demand that the administration give heed to congressional critics of its Vietnam policy and that the Congress remain in session so that the stream of criticism can continue for the remainder of the year.

Senator MORSE should pause to consider why people with such an outlandish idea as impeachment of the President should seek him out for questioning. Such charges as once accusing administration officials of homicide make him the logical repository for screwball ideas.

This certainly should be the source of his concern. It proves beyond any doubt that

the far-left critics of President Johnson's foreign policy have become irrational in their objections and that they are running far beyond the bounds of intelligent debate. They are certainly "out of control."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I could not find a better recommendation for my position on any issue than to discover that Goldwater is against it. The reason why he made such little imprint on American public opinion in 1964 is well illustrated by the tactics to which he resorted in publishing this article.

I should like to suggest to Mr. Goldwater that he give instructions to his ghost writers at least to tell the whole story. However, we do not expect that from Mr. Goldwater and his ghost writers.

Mr. President, the column takes great exception because I pointed out in the Senate that there are those in this country who seek to resort to impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States because of his undeclared, unconstitutional, and illegal war in southeast Asia. But, there is not a word in the Goldwater distortions to show that I made perfectly clear that I completely disagree with the position taken by those talking about impeachment.

The first reference to communications which I received, and discussions which I have heard concerning impeachment, was in reference to comments I made in the Senate on August 3 setting forth again, as I have so many times, my disapproval of the President's executive handling of the conduct of the war without the slightest constitutional authority to do so. I pointed out in that speech of August 3 that the President has come under criticism for conducting a war without a declaration of war. Further, I pointed out that it should be evident that if Congress goes ahead with its present plan to adjourn by Labor Day, or shortly thereafter, the war in Vietnam will be even more completely an executive war than it is now, because Congress, at least at the present time, if it wills, has the constitutional checks which it can apply to the President, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense.

I also pointed out that Congress could do more to protect the President from impeachment talk if it remained in session, because it would be in a position to exercise its checking function; whereas with Congress out of session for 3 or 4 months, the President would be exposed to rising charges that he is conducting a war without reference to the Constitution.

During the past few weeks I have said over and over again that I believe the best friends of the President in Congress are those who wish to keep Congress in session. I have suggested that if Congress feels that its schedule permits it to take a recess of 1, 2, or 3 weeks at a time, it might consider doing that, but to adjourn sine die would be something different.

I do not believe we can morally justify adjourning Congress sine die with American boys dying in southeast Asia in a war that could spread rapidly.

We have a clear duty, connected with

our positions of public responsibility, to stay in session, if it is for no other reason than to remain here to participate in our constitutional duties as a check upon the executive branch of the Government under our system of three coequal and coordinate branches of government while a war, even though in this instance an unconstitutional war, is being fought and supreme sacrifices are being made.

There is not the slightest reference in the Goldwater trash that he published in his column yesterday about the speech I made on August 4. He quotes from my August 3 speech. On August 4 I repeated the language to which Goldwater refers from my August 3 speech. Then I went on to say, quoting from my August 4 speech:

Then I went on to make a statement as why, in my judgment, Congress should not adjourn sine die but should remain in session until January 1. I pointed out that we should remain in session and carry out our constitutional responsibility of serving as a legislative check upon executive action.

There are those, judging from the interviews with the press today, and from telephone calls that the senior Senator from Oregon has received, who interpret my remarks as indicating that I advocate the impeachment of the President.

Of course, such an interpretation is nonsense.

Then I proceeded to develop my reasons for opposing any suggestion about impeachment, and set out the contents of the letters that I had sent out in answer to such suggestions, in which I made perfectly clear that I thoroughly disapprove of any impeachment proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the August 4, 1965, speech be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I said in a speech on the floor of the Senate.

"Mr. President, in my trip across the country and back since I spoke on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, I have been alarmed by the rising denunciation of the President and his administration for their Vietnam policy. I have heard the word 'impeach' used more often in the last week than I have heard it since President Truman sacked General MacArthur. I have been asked by more people than I would have thought possible if there is not grounds for impeachment of the President, and how the process can be set in motion. I have been advised about petitions that have been circulated and hundreds of people are signing asking for the President's impeachment.

"Much of this talk stems from objections to a war being undertaken without congressional declaration. Most of these people see the President as waging an executive war, in violation of the Constitution. They think the impeachment clauses of the Constitution must apply to such a case."

Then I went on to make a statement as to why, in my judgment, Congress should not adjourn sine die but should remain in session until January 1. I pointed out that we should remain in session and carry out our constitutional responsibility of serving as a legislative check upon the executive action.

There are those, judging from the interviews with the press today, and from telephone calls that the senior Senator from Oregon has received, who interpret my re-

marks as indicating that I advocate the impeachment of the President.

Of course, such an interpretation is nonsense.

Mr. President, I have been receiving a great deal of mail in regard to this matter and many people have talked to me at meetings at which I have spoken in opposition to the President's war in Vietnam. I have been answering all of the mail on the impeachment matter with a letter that contains these two paragraphs. I read two paragraphs from a letter dated July 6, 1968. I have sent similar letters before and since that time:

"In your letter, you asked me for my views concerning your suggestion that steps should be taken to impeach President Johnson and perhaps some other officials. It is my view that such an impeachment attempt would be a very serious mistake. All it would do would be to divert attention away from the basic issues involved in American foreign policy in Asia and center attention on President Johnson, as an individual. It would cause many people who disagree with his foreign policy to rally behind him, because they would consider such a movement to be an ad hominem approach. Attacking Johnson, personally, will not change his course of action, and it will not win supporters for a change of foreign policy in Asia, but to the contrary, it will drive supporters away.

In my opinion, there is no question about Johnson's sincerity or his patriotism or his desire for peace. It is Johnson's bad judgment and mistaken reasoning in respect to the war in Asia that constitute the basis of the crucial problems that confront us in trying to get a change in Johnson's policies in Asia. To attack him, personally, by proposing impeachment would be the most serious personal attack that could be made upon him. It would rally the Nation behind him and result in his policies being escalated into a major war at a much faster rate. Those of us who oppose Johnson's foreign policies must meet his views on their merits. We should never attack him, personally."

I wish the RECORD to show that this letter represents the position the senior Senator from Oregon has taken in all correspondence on the subject. Also, it represents my answers to questions on impeachment at all rallies I have attended, and in all my conversations with those who urge impeachment of the President.

Those that I have talked to and who have written to me suggesting impeachment of the President are not extremists in the sense that they are irresponsible persons. Many of them are on the faculties of American universities. Many of them are out of the professional life of our Nation.

I have no intention of joining them in such a program. Nevertheless, I believe it is a significant fact that there is growing discussion in this country of an attempt to stop the President from his illegal war in southeast Asia, even to the extent of circulating impeachment petitions.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say in reply to the Senator from Ohio that it is not at all surprising for people in the country who think the President is following an unconscionable and illegal course of action in South Vietnam to turn to the Constitution and look for what procedural protection they have. They have a perfect right to turn to the impeachment procedure. I believe that they are making a great mistake in judgment. I, of course, would defend them in their right to exercise their constitutional rights. But, in one sense, I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that until the President follows his constitutional obligation by coming before this body and asking for a declaration of war, the President is en-

gaged in an illegal war. It is a war now conducted by the Chief Executive, in South Vietnam without a scintilla of constitutional right. This Congress is likewise guilty of violating its duties under the Constitution by seeking to delegate to the President a power that it cannot constitutionally delegate. It is the duty of the Congress under article I, section 8, either to declare war or to stop the President from slaughtering American boys in southeast Asia. I have no doubt that impeachment talk will increase if the President continues to conduct an unconstitutional war.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me make very clear that the more Barry Goldwater attacks me the better I like it, because that will only show how right I am. He was dead wrong throughout the campaign in his shocking proposals for military action which would have involved us in a major war in Asia. It is with great regret that I find my President has followed to too great a degree the very unsound position that Goldwater took during the campaign.

I still hope, upon further reflection and as more and more evidence comes in with respect to the great concern that exists throughout the country with respect to our military course of action in southeast Asia, that my Government will return to the framework of international law and that we will put the members of the United Nations on the spot by formally submitting the entire subject to the Security Council, and in that way find out who it is who really believes in substituting the rule of law for military might as a means of settling disputes which have raised this serious threat to the peace of the world.

#### THE DEADLOCK IN CONFERENCE ON THE FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the country now knows, the Senate conferees and the House conferees have been in deadlock over the foreign aid authorization bill. The Senate committee and the Senate adopted the Fulbright-Morse amendment to the foreign aid bill. The first part of the proposal submitted by the Senator from Arkansas would authorize a 2-year extension of foreign aid.

The second part, the amendment which I offered—and which I have offered for several past years—seeks to bring the present program of foreign aid to an end.

The date of my amendment this year was the beginning of fiscal year 1967. In the intervening period a thorough study of foreign aid would be made by a special committee, to the end of starting a new foreign aid program on the basis of new rules and procedures and policies, to the extent that the old program needs to be changed, as found by that study; and the objective should be that the new program should seek to limit the foreign aid program to 50 nations, although we made very clear, as the RECORD will show at the time the Senate debated the matter, that there is nothing fixed about the figure 50, and that if the study showed that it ought to

be a higher number or a lesser number, another number ought to be selected.

Mr. President, it is highly significant that the Foreign Relations Committee this year formally adopted my amendment. The present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. LONG of Louisiana], a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, knows that for the past 2 years serious consideration has been given to the Morse proposal. In my two dissenting reports in the past 2 years on foreign aid I pointed out that the majority in their report was kind enough to point out that their feeling was there had been great errors in foreign aid, but that they felt the administration should be given a further opportunity to bring about the necessary changes and reforms.

The Presiding Officer knows that in the past 2 years I have said that the majority of the committee had made my case for me, and that when they admit that reforms are necessary it clearly becomes the responsibility of the Foreign Relations Committee to make recommendations for reforms.

This year, in contrast to the majority position of the last 2 years, the committee started adopting some reforms. The Fulbright proposal for a 2-year authorization, coupled with the Morse proposal for ending the program at the beginning of fiscal year 1965, and starting a new program, was really a matter of major moment in connection with foreign aid.

Without disclosing any privileged matter, as the papers have stated, the Foreign Relations Committee met last week, on August 12, with the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and the director of foreign aid, Mr. Bell, and they discussed the impasse that has developed between the Senate conferees and the House conferees, and it was pointed out that there was a deadlock.

The Presiding Officer knows that deadlocks are resolved. The Presiding Officer knows that someone will recede.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate that I pay high tribute to the chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I am indeed proud of the insistence of the Senate conferees in conferences with the House, in their attempt to work out a conscientious accommodation of the differences which exist between the two conference groups.

We also know that the administration has put on the heat. The administration wants a conference report. I can understand that. However, I believe that in getting a conference report, unless the suggestion I am about to make is accepted, the end result will be closer to what the House wants than what the Senate has passed. I hope not, but that is my fear.

I have made clear that I cannot vote in conference for the renewal of the old program. The American people are entitled to something better. I believe that the real friends of foreign aid should insist on something better. In my judgment, if we continue foreign aid on the basis which has characterized it in the

past, the American people will rise up against it at the polls and make perfectly clear to the Members of Congress that they are fed up with it.

They should have done it several years ago. Since 1946 we have had a program costing some \$111 billion which is so honeycombed with inefficiency and shocking waste, and is the cause of so much corruption in so many parts of the world, that it ought to be stopped. I believe the military aid aspects of foreign aid explain to a remarkable degree some of the serious plights in which the United States finds itself in those areas of the world where strong anti-American feeling is developing; and more of that is entering. I mention it in passing tonight only because I wish to say that those of us who are insisting upon a reform of foreign aid are the true friends of foreign aid. Officers of the present administration who wish to continue foreign aid as it has been will, in my judgment, run into such strenuous opposition from the American people that they are the ones who will do great damage to the positive, affirmative aspects that could characterize a sound foreign aid program.

I shall not sign a conference report and I shall not vote for a conference report, as I made very clear to the conference, and as I have made very clear heretofore in the Senate, that is merely a conference report that would give the American taxpayers more of the same—more waste, more inefficiency, more corruption, and more expeditors to postpone the day of reckoning in the underdeveloped areas of the world. So I have proposed a continuing resolution on foreign aid on a temporary basis until there can be some crystallization of a foreign aid program that will at least include some procedures therein which will make it possible for us to go ahead with the reform of foreign aid.

But, it is said, "What about Vietnam?" Let us face it. Vietnam no longer has anything to do with the foreign aid program. Vietnam is in a class by itself.

The funds for Vietnam are included in the foreign aid bill, but everyone knows that, in the months ahead, we shall receive requests from the administration for additional funds for Vietnam, and those measures will be passed.

I do not believe, in connection with the continuing resolution with respect to foreign aid, that Vietnam presents any sound argument against such a continuing resolution.

What we should do is to give consideration to a continuing resolution on foreign aid. The Senate ought to consider a continuing resolution rather than a new foreign aid bill which, in my judgment, would entrench more deeply the existing evils of our present foreign aid bill. I make these comments today because I wish to make them as a matter of public record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to express the hope that my President, the Secretary of State, and the director of foreign aid, Mr. Bell, will give careful thought to the suggestion.

I am not alone in making the suggestion, because other members of the committee, in effect, said in the presence of the Secretary of State the other day that they would like to have the Department of State be prepared to advise us as to what insurmountable problems would be created by such a continuing resolution, if any—and I do not believe there are any.

It is better for the Senate and for the House to adopt a continuing resolution of aid as it now exists rather than to go ahead and adopt a new foreign aid bill before we have had the time to make the necessary reforms or time to make the necessary reforms for a new foreign aid program. So I make that suggestion tonight in the hope that the administration will consider it. If a conference report based upon a receding by the Senate conferees, or a majority thereof, comes to the floor of the Senate, it will stir up a considerable discussion in the Senate and in the country, because the

public generally, in my opinion, wishes foreign aid cleaned up.

The bill before us for conference with the Fulbright-Morse amendments eliminated would give the American people no hope for cleaning up of foreign aid under that bill. The Senate should consider and adopt a continuing resolution because of a deadlock in conference and because there is a growing recognition of the situation on the part of the conferees, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Members of the Senate; and the sentiment is also prevalent in the House. There is one House conferee who goes even further than I go in regard to foreign aid. He would lead one to believe that he would be perfectly willing to end it for all time.

Interestingly, I consider myself a stronger advocate, or an advocate of foreign aid as strong as any Member of the Senate, bar none, but an entirely different type of foreign aid than has been fleecing the American taxpayers out of billions of dollars for so many years.

So if we really wish to be friends of foreign aid, the Senate and the House ought to support a resolution that would continue, for another year, foreign aid as it was administered under the old bill. Such action would not prevent it from being adopted with the clear understanding that Vietnam is excluded, and Vietnam will be considered by itself in the light of the needs as that illegal war progresses.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

August 16, 1965

Brother E. L. Schovajsa of Temple. We were delighted to talk briefly to the group and meet the students individually. They are a well-mannered, alert, and pleasant group of young people. Their instructor is Brother John L. Chervenka, who is principal of Rogers High School, and also teaches Spanish. Czech I is taught the first year and Czech II the next. Last year's Czech I class numbered 23; this year's Czech class numbers 10, which is about normal. The classes use the Mikula text, published in 1936. No State funds are available for the purchase of newer or revised texts, because of a State education requirement that before a free text can be supplied, over 10,000 students must be enrolled in a particular course in the State. The class is very short on dictionaries. Your editor promised that he would try to help them out in this regard. A good Czech-English and English-Czech dictionary is available through the Czechoslovak Publishing Co., here in West, for a price of \$6. Here is a good chance for someone who wants to do something good and worth while for the cause of the Czech language and its survival in what is probably the last outpost of Czech instruction in the whole United States of America. Anyone wishing to purchase this dictionary for the permanent use of Rogers High School Czech classes may do so by making out their check, payable to the Czechoslovak Publishing Co., indicating on the check what it is for, and we will do the rest. The Vestnik will publish the list of donors, and if you'd like, we'll insert the name of each donor in the dictionary. A lot of people wax strong about the sad plight of the Czech language here in Texas. Here then, is a direct way to aid the cause. They need your help. How about it? Now is the time to prepare for the fall school semester.

Brother Chervenka is a member of SPJST Lodge No. 69, New Colony, and is doing a fine job with these young people, considering the tools he has available. His brother, Calvin, is also an SPJST member, and teaches at Temple Junior College. The SPJST is well represented among the young people at Rogers High.

Our sincere thanks to Brother Schovajsa for his invitation, and to Brother Chervenka, students and faculty at Rogers High, our congratulations, and may every success be yours.

The following article appeared in a recent issue of the Temple Daily Telegram, and we are indebted to Brother Leonard D. Mikeska for calling our attention to it.—Editor.

#### CZECH LANGUAGE CLASS AT ROGERS ONLY ONE IN NATION

(By Beth Allen)

ROGERS.—A teenage boy stood in front of a class last week and read a newspaper article about President John F. Kennedy published on the first anniversary of his assassination.

But he's not a member of a civics class whose time-sense is out of whack.

He's a member of the only public high school Czech class in the Nation and he'd already read the article in Czech. Now he's translating.

The article appeared in the Vestnik, the Czech-English newspaper published in West, in central Texas, and the student is a member of the Czech II class at Rogers High School.

The Vestnik is used as a supplementary text. J. L. Chervenka, who teaches the class, said they have about a year's supply of old Vestnicks they used for reading.

The State-adopted text is the oldest in the State, according to Chervenka. It was published back in 1936 and adopted in 1937 and is loaded with drills but has little reading matter.

Because it's the only public high school Czech class in the Nation, the Rogers class

finds reading matter a little hard to come by. Hence, the use of the Vestnik.

However, persons who want their children to learn some foreign language in high school other than Spanish and French, probably shouldn't dash out and move to Rogers.

Unless their children speak Czech at home they might find the sledding a little rough. Texas has a large number of citizens of Czech origin, many of them only second or third generation native Texans, and many of these citizens live in and around Rogers.

So Czech at Rogers High School is not actually taught as a foreign language, Chervenka said.

Most of the students already speak Czech by the time they enroll in the course. However, they are actually illiterate in the language, just as English-speaking students are illiterate in English until they study it in school. In other words, they can speak it fluently, perhaps with faultless grammar, but can't read or write the language.

So the emphasis in the Czech classes (Czech I is taught one year and Czech II the next) is not on obtaining a basic vocabulary and learning the grammar from scratch, but enlarging the students' vocabularies and improving their grammar.

The textbook is used to provide grammatical rules and drill. The Vestnik provides practice in reading aloud in Czech and translating from Czech to English and from English to Czech. Mr. Chervenka uses a program with "a lot of original writing in Czech. These Czech themes are reproduced and distributed to the class for translation to English.

Last year's Czech I class numbered 23. This year's Czech II class is smaller, as is usual with language classes. There are 10 in the group.

The credits these students earn are accepted in colleges across the land as foreign language credits.

Chervenka also teaches Spanish at Rogers High School and is principal.

The class was first organized in the fall of 1957 and has been offered every year since then on the alternating basis.

B. F. Harbour, superintendent of schools, figures Rogers High School is a fine place to offer the course. "About 85 students out of the 205 enrolled in high school are Czech," he said.

Rogers' unique place in modern language instruction came to light in a nationwide survey made by a language association. A school in Illinois listed the course, but no current class was reported.

Students enrolled in Czech II this year are Margaret Malina, Johnnie Elsik, Willie Janicek, J. W. Pechal, Shirley Pekar, Anton Hutka, David Vanicek, Calvin Motl, Linhart Pechal, and Edward Skrabaneck.

*Se (D) Lipscomb*  
Address of Richard M. Nixon on Herbert  
Hoover's 91st Birth Date

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1965, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon delivered a commemorative speech in West Branch, Iowa, as part of his tribute to one of our greatest Americans, former President Herbert Hoover. This remarkable address beau-

tifully commemorates the former President and made him live again by applying his principles and his beliefs toward today's major problem, Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD Mr. Nixon's speech because I believe the points he makes and the course he charts should be brought to the attention of the Congress:

HERBERT HOOVER 91ST BIRTH DATE COMMEMORATIVE PROGRAM, WEST BRANCH, IOWA, AUGUST 10, 1965

(Address by Richard M. Nixon)

This distinguished gathering, honored by the presence of General Eisenhower, is in itself, an eloquent tribute to one of America's greatest leaders. The honor which has been accorded to me to add to that tribute provides a wide and rich choice of subjects.

For over 50 years Herbert Hoover walked as an equal among the giants of the earth.

We could honor him for his service as President of the United States.

We could honor him for his achievements as an engineer and as an author.

We could honor him for his contribution to the cause of more efficient government through the reports of the Hoover Commissions on Government Reorganization.

We could honor him for the selfless service which earned him worldwide recognition as the great humanitarian of the 20th century.

But, great as were his achievements, Eugene Lyons was probably correct in concluding that Herbert Hoover will be remembered more for what he was than what he did.

In terms of public esteem, never has one man fallen so low and risen so high. Thirty-three years ago he left the White House vilified by his enemies and forsaken even by some of his friends. Like Secretary Rusk, he had learned how viciously cruel so-called scholars can be in writing of their contemporaries.

In that dreary March of 1932, Herbert Hoover could well have been described as the "man nobody knows." This warm, kind, generous, shy, witty, and progressive humanitarian was painted as a cold, heartless, selfish, aloof, humorless reactionary.

But time has a way of healing the wounds inflicted by excessive partisanship. If the commentators of the decade were cruel, the historians of the century will be kinder. Before his death he became a living example of the truth of the words Sophocles wrote 2,000 years ago. "One must wait until the evening to see how splendid the day has been."

His legion of friends can be forever grateful that Herbert Hoover was one of those rare leaders who lived to hear the overwhelming favorable verdict of history on his public career.

No words can add luster to the special place he has earned in the hearts of his countrymen. But let it be noted that for generations to come his magnificence in adversity will be an everlasting example to those who would achieve greatness. A lesser man would have lashed back at his critics. But, Herbert Hoover was one of those unique individuals who was capable of great anger against corruption, brutality, and evil but never against people.

His serenity, in the face of the most brutal attacks, in the end made his detractors seem like pygmies and allowed his fellow Americans to see even more clearly the great character of the giant who walked among them.

To limit my remarks on this occasion to a discussion of his achievements would certainly be appropriate. But the highest tribute a nation can pay to one of its great men is to honor his principles in the adoption of national policy. In that spirit, let us test our policy in Vietnam against the foreign policy principles of Herbert Hoover.

August 16, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

ico City, in which the United States participated, for welding all the Americas together, and to preserve for the Western Hemisphere the Pan American unity of freedom loving people, that would be the perpetual harbinger against the attempt of any form of despotism to plant the tyrant's heel on even the tiniest portion of the soil of our Pan American nations, as the Soviet Union and Dr. Castro have actually done in Cuba, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Were General Alfaro alive today, he would be a zealous supporter of the work and program of the United Nations. This great Ecuadorian statesman and dedicated leader would have left no stone unturned to assure, for all the peoples of the world, that hope and peace and good will to all men that is our common heritage from our common Creator.

This foundation was organized to perpetuate and further the political and moral values of the Americas advanced by General Alfaro, for whom the foundation was named, and who at the turn of the century was the President of Ecuador for two terms.

The philosophy of General Alfaro was based principally on service to his fellow human beings, and to the cause of international peace.

The public and private activities of Imperial Sir O. Carlyle Brock, imperial potente, comes within the framework of the kind of service to humanity, and particularly in his extraordinary service to the Shrine and the Shrine hospitals for North America.

In recognition of this fact, the ruling body of the foundation grants you, Imperial Sir O. Carlyle Brock, imperial potente, its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

You are now among the elite and select group of humanitarians who have been similarly honored by the foundation in the past. They include the late Presidents F. D. Roosevelt, J. F. Kennedy, and Herbert Hoover, and the late General of the Armies, Douglas MacArthur, former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, and President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, Irving L. Mermer, Ray Holtz, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Governors Rockefeller and Harriman, Senators MANSFIELD and DURKSEN, along with Imperial Sir Barney Collins, who typify the caliber of men who have been theretofore honored.

Therefore, it now gives us the privilege and honor to call upon Imperial Sir Barney Collins, our next imperial potente, to carry out the determination of the board of dignitaries to invest Imperial Sir O. Carlyle Brock with the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

## ACCEPTANCE OF SIR O. CARLYLE BROCK

Dr. Bayern, American provost, members of the Imperial Divan, Illustrious Protentes of the Temples for North America, distinguished guests, my charming wife, children and grandchildren, and fellow nobles of the Shrine for North America.

I am overwhelmed and from the bottom of my heart, I wish to express my appreciation to all my fellow Nobles from Mecca Temple, particularly the ambassadors from Mecca, who have honored me this afternoon with the top honor of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, with the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

I was thrilled when Sir Barney Collins, my successor, bestowed this high honor on me. I accept this award, not for myself alone, but for all 850,000 Nobles of North America, as whose leader I had the privilege of serving our great fraternity for 1964 to 1965, and I pledge my continued cooperation, to our newly elected imperial potente.

To be able to join this select and elite company of those distinguished recipients who have been honored in the past, is indeed a high honor, and I shall regard it as an in-

spiration to accelerate my efforts in carrying out the high ideals and principles of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama.

May I now call my wonderful and charming wife, Emily, and the rest of my married children and grandchildren, to come to the platform to share this honor with me and you. I wish at this time to pay a special tribute and thanks to my charming wife, and helpmate, who has been my inspiration and help, which enabled me to efficiently carry out my responsibilities as your imperial potente during my term of office during the 1964 to 1965 period.

I wish to again express my personal appreciation to Sir Barney Collins, now imperial potente for the period from 1965 to 1966, Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, and ambassador to Irving L. Mermer, illustrious potente, Mecca Temple, and to all other members of Mecca Temple, who participated in conferring this award on me. I hope and pray that we may have peace in our time.

## The Real Alabama—Part XLV

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, capital investment in the State of Alabama amounted to more than \$1 billion in the past 28 months.

Translated into terms of job opportunities, this means a total of more than 45,000 jobs created by this capital investment in a State where economic progress is solid and consistent.

More on this subject is presented in the following editorial from the Mobile Register newspaper of August 10, 1965: TEN-STRIKE FOR STATE IN INDUSTRIAL GAINS

Alabama has scored a 10-strike in excess of a billion dollars in industrial progress in approximately the past 2 years.

This notable achievement is brought to attention by the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce in the August issue of its monthly bulletin.

A July survey by the State chamber developed the fact that the past 28 months new and expanded industrial projects announced for Alabama amounted to more than \$1 billion in capital expenditures.

"Business and industrial leaders have expressed their confidence in Alabama's future with this tremendous capital investment outlay and it will benefit every segment of the State's population and form a base for greater future growth," says the State chamber of commerce.

"Leader in industrial expansion and development in the entire Southeast in 1964, Alabama broke all records with a whopping \$406 million announced total capital investment for new and expanded industries, the largest total reported by any Southeastern State."

"When these new and expanded industrial facilities are put into production, they will offer 45,720 additional job opportunities."

Three key factors in the rapid industrial growth of Alabama are summed up in this observation in the report:

"The magic of materials, markets and manpower is continuing to attract manufacturing."

These, of course, are by no means all of the reasons why Alabama is progressing so fast industrially.

The State chamber also pinpoints such other reasons as these: "The State's remarkably abundant supply of fresh water, natural resources, field, forest and soil, and mild climate all are contributing toward the outstanding industrial record."

Of special direct interest in Mobile is the relation between the statewide industrial growth of Alabama and the growth of shipping through this port.

"Alabama's well diversified industrial base helps stimulate foreign trade through the Port of Mobile," the report in the August Bulletin reminds.

"Rubber, coffee, sugar, jute and iron ore pass through the port going to Alabama plants. In turn, Alabama-made products are loaded on ships at the State docks to be transported to world markets."

"Alabama manufacturing firms which participate in direct export trade cover almost the entire range of industrial activity and are located in every part of the State."

Completion of the 40-foot Mobile Bay ship channel, making Mobile harbor one of the deepest in the Nation, still better equips this industrial seaport to serve world trade, a good fortune not only for the port itself and the rest of Alabama but for vast outside areas both in this country and abroad.

## Czech Language Taught at Rogers, Tex., High School

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, some time ago, one of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate expressed concern and disappointment over the fact that no high school in the United States taught Czech language as a credit course.

I would like to point with pride to a recent article in the newspaper *Vestnik* for Wednesday, June 2, 1965, which describes the Czech language course at Rogers High School in Rogers, Tex. This central Texas town is the only high school in the United States that currently teaches Czech as a credit language course, and it has been offering a course in Czech since the fall of 1957.

To describe the teaching of Czech at Rogers High School, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles on page 3 through 5 of the Wednesday, June 2, 1965, issue of the newspaper *Vestnik* be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## CZECH CLASS AT ROGERS HIGH SCHOOL

The small Central Texas town of Rogers has been receiving some rather unusual publicity in recent weeks, as the nationwide foreign language survey. It seems that Rogers High School is the only public high school in the United States that currently teaches Czech as a credit language course. A school in Illinois was listed as offering Czech, but no enrollment in the course.

It was an honor for your editor to be recently invited to address this year's Czech class at Rogers High School. The occasion was the annual and traditional evening luncheon sponsored by a very good friend of the Czech language and Czech culture.

August 16, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300130013-1  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD APPENDIX

A4541

It would be presumptuous to say what position he would take on Vietnam if he were alive today. But the principles which would guide him in making that decision ring out true and clear from the record of his public statements.

Speaking at the Republican Convention in Chicago in 1944, he said:

"We want to live in peace."

"We want no territory."

"We want no domination over any nation."

"We want the freedom of nations from the domination of others."

"We want it both in the cause of freedom and because there can be no lasting peace if enslaved people must ceaselessly strive and fight for freedom."

There was no fuzzymindedness in his analysis of the cold war. To him the choice between communism and freedom was crystal clear. He said: "The world is divided by opposing concepts of life. One is good, the other is evil."

Yet, while he hated the Communist idea the great humanitarian had no hatred for the Russian people. It was his leadership after World War I which helped feed and save the lives of millions of Russian children.

In summary, the principles which Herbert Hoover would apply in making a foreign policy decision could be summed up in one sentence. He wanted peace, freedom, non-intervention, self-determination, and progress for all peoples and all nations.

America's critics at home and abroad contend that our policy at Vietnam is diametrically opposed to every one of these principles.

They contend that America is intervening in a civil war.

They contend that we are fighting a losing battle to perpetuate white colonialism in Asia.

They contend that we are on the side of reaction, resisting the forces of change and progress.

They contend that we are increasing the danger of world war III.

Even among the majority of Americans who support our policy too many seem to believe that we had no business getting involved in Vietnam in the first place and that all we can hope or try to do is to make the best of a bad situation.

There is no reason for Americans to be defensive or apologetic about our role in Vietnam. We can hold our heads high in the knowledge that—as was the case in World War I, World War II, and Korea—we are fighting not just in the interests of South Vietnam or of the United States but for peace, freedom, and progress for all peoples.

This is not a case of American intervention in a civil war. We are helping South Vietnam resist Communist intervention.

We are not attempting to impose American colonialism in Vietnam. We are there to prevent Communist colonialism and to preserve the rights of self-determination without outside intervention for the people of South Vietnam.

We are fighting on the side of progress for the Vietnamese people; the Communists are fighting against progress. One of the reasons the South Vietnamese have been willing to fight so long and so bravely against the Communists is that they know that North Vietnam, under communism is an economic slum. The per capita income of South Vietnam under freedom is twice as high as that of North Vietnam.

The greatest fallacy is the contention that U.S. policy in Vietnam increases the danger of war. On the contrary, stopping Communist aggression will reduce the danger of war. Failing to stop it will increase the danger of war.

This is true because, if the Communists gain from their aggression, they will be encouraged to try it again.

It is true because, if aggression is rewarded those who advocate the hard line in Peking and Moscow will have won the day over those who favor peaceful coexistence, and we shall be confronted with other Vietnams in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

It is true because, if the Communists gain from their aggression in Vietnam, all of southeast Asia would come under Communist domination, and we would have to fight a major war to save the Philippines.

A crucial issue is being decided in Vietnam: Does the free world have an answer to the Communist tactic of taking over a free country not by direct attack as in Korea, not by winning a free election, but by fermenting and supporting a revolution? If this tactic proves unsuccessful in Vietnam, the steady Communist march to world domination will be halted. If it succeeds, the Communists will have the green light for conquest by support of revolution all over the world, and we will be helpless to stop it.

This is one of those critical turning points in history. Today Russia and Red China are not allies. Red China without Russia is a fourth-rate military power with no significant nuclear capability. Five years from now the two Communist giants may have patched up their differences. Even if they have failed to do so, Red China will then have a dangerous nuclear capability.

Time, therefore, is not on our side. If the Communist aggressors are not stopped now, the risk of stopping them later will be infinitely greater.

Too much of the discussion on Vietnam has been in the dreary terms of day-to-day tactics, of targets to be hit or excluded, of the cost involved.

It is time for all Americans to raise their eyes proudly to the great goals for which we are fighting in Vietnam.

We are fighting in Vietnam to prevent world war III.

We are fighting for the right of self-determination for all nations, large and small.

We are fighting to save free Asia from Communist domination.

We are fighting for the right of all people to enjoy progress through freedom.

We are fighting to prevent the Pacific from becoming a Red sea.

To achieve these goals, Americans must be united in their determination not to fall the cause of peace and freedom in this period of crisis.

The noisy minority which constantly talks of the need to make concessions to the Communist aggressors in order to gain peace are defeating the very purpose they claim to serve. This kind of talk discourages our friends, encourages our enemies, and prolongs the war.

The Communists do not have to be told that we are for peace; they have to be convinced that they cannot win the war.

We shall agree to any honorable peace but on one issue there can be no compromise. There can be no reward for aggression.

Forcing the South Vietnamese into a coalition government with the Communists would be a reward for aggression.

Neutralizing South Vietnam would be a reward for aggression.

Forcing the South Vietnamese to give up any territory to the Communist aggressors would be a reward for aggression.

History tells us that a coalition government would be only the first step toward a complete Communist takeover.

Neutralization, where the Communists are concerned, as we learned in Laos, would mean—we get out, they stay in, they take over.

Attempting to buy peace by turning over territory to the Communist aggressors would only whet their appetite for more.

We welcome the interest of the United Nations in seeking a settlement. But we

must insist that where the security of the United States is directly threatened by international Communist aggression, the final policy decision must be made by the United States and not by the United Nations.

We respect the views of nations who choose to remain neutral in the struggle between communism and freedom. But in evaluating those views let us remember that no nation in the world could afford the luxury of neutrality if it were not for the power of the United States.

The struggle will be long. The cost will be great. But the reward will be victory over aggression and a world in which peace and freedom will have a better chance to survive.

Herbert Hoover's record gives us guidance also with regard to our future policy when peace finally comes in Vietnam.

The man who hated communism helped save the lives of millions of Russian people living under communism after World War I.

The man who hated dictatorship set up the Committee for Small Nations to aid the people forced to live under Hitler's dictatorship in World War II.

Herbert Hoover took a dim view of trade or aid programs which might strengthen the power of dictatorial governments over their people. That is why he insisted that American aid to the starving Russian people be administered not by the Communist government but by the American Relief Administration which he headed.

We must continue to step up our air and sea attacks on North Vietnam until the Communist leaders stop their aggression against South Vietnam. But completely consistent with that policy would be the establishment now of an American Committee To Aid the People of North Vietnam.

What I am suggesting is not a government-to-government program which would simply strengthen the domination of the Communist Government of North Vietnam over the people of that unhappy country but a people-to-people program. The American people, through contributions to such a committee, would send to the people of North Vietnam food, medicine, clothing, and other materials which would help them recover from the devastating destruction of war.

If the government of North Vietnam raised objections to allowing an American agency to administer the program, the distribution of supplies could be undertaken by an independent agency like the International Red Cross.

Certainly a program of this type would be in the great humanitarian tradition of Herbert Hoover.

As we consider the problems we face, let us not overlook one great factor which is working in our favor in Asia.

Twelve years ago, the Communist propaganda in Vietnam and in other free Asian nations was based on one major theme—choose communism and you will enjoy a better way of life.

Today that propaganda line no longer has any credibility. Those who join the Vietcong in Vietnam do so not because they like communism, but because they fear it.

In the past 12 years the only nations in southeast Asia and the Pacific which have enjoyed sustained economic progress are those in which freedom has been given a chance—Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia. The economic failures have been Communist China and Communist North Vietnam and Burma and Indonesia—both of which chose the Socialist road to economic bankruptcy.

There is a lesson in this record for America. At a time when other nations are turning toward freedom, let us not turn away from it.

Herbert Hoover spoke eloquently on this subject at West Branch on his 75th birthday:

August 16, 1965

"A splendid storehouse of integrity and freedom has been bequeathed to us by our forefathers. Our duty is to see that that storehouse is not robbed of its contents."

"We dare not see the birthright of posterity to independence, initiative, and freedom of choice bartered for a mess of a collectivist system."

Again on his 80th birthday he returned to the same theme:

"It is dinned into us that this is the century of the common man. The whole idea is another cousin of the Soviet proletarian. The uncommon man is to be whittled down to size. It is the negation of individual dignity and a slogan of mediocrity and uniformity."

"The greatest strides of human progress have come from uncommon men and women."

"The humor of it is that when we get sick, we want an uncommon doctor. When we go to war, we yearn for an uncommon general. When we choose the president of a university, we want an uncommon educator."

"The imperative need of this Nation at all times is the leadership of the uncommon men or women."

And, just 1 year ago on his 90th birthday, he reminded his fellow countrymen again for the last time: "Freedom is the open window through which pours the sunlight of the human spirit and of human dignity."

We were privileged to have lived in the same century with this uncommon, extraordinary man. As we meet in this typically American town, in the heartland of our country, may we honor his principles as we pay tribute to his memory.

### Freedom Academy Bill Advancing

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. KARL E. MUNDT**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, unanimous committee approval in the House of the Freedom Academy bill has stimulated greatly expanded interest in and support for the inauguration of this badly needed program for training America's peacetime operatives in the cold war.

Likewise, our continuing problems in Vietnam provide a daily reminder of the deficiencies involved in a national program which relies too greatly on guns and bombs, on blood and bullets, to win enduring victories which cannot be obtained without a sharply revised and reinforced approach to the problems of training our friends in South Vietnam on the important and imperative techniques required to maintain a stable, sound, and strong civilian government capable of preserving the victories won in a shooting war.

South Dakota newspapers have with great unanimity expressed their approval of the Freedom Academy approach and I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial from the Aberdeen, S. Dak., American News under the heading of "Freedom Academy Bill Advancing."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FREEDOM ACADEMY BILL ADVANCING

South Dakotans, aware of the merits of the Freedom Academy proposal that has

been advocated for years by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, are encouraged by the progress it has made this summer.

The Freedom Academy bill, a measure to establish a comprehensive nonmilitary program to meet political warfare needs in the global struggle against communism, has been given unanimous approval by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Although the bill, introduced by Senator MUNDT, in 1959, had won Senate approval in 1960 it had been victim of a legislative jam in the House.

With reintroduction in the House and Senate this year—under Senator MUNDT's guidance—the bill received a helpful recommendation from the committee report.

The report outlined the effectiveness and history of Communist efforts in political warfare and detailed the fact "there is a serious gap in the defenses of the United States, and the non-Communist world generally, on the political warfare front." It said: "There is a vital and pressing need for an extensive and thoroughgoing program of education, research, and training in this area to close the gap."

In additional argument in favor of the bill the committee report said:

"Clearly, if freedom is to remain a distinguishing characteristic of our civilization, if world peace and the national interests of the United States are to be preserved, communism must be decisively countered and checked \* \* \*. (The Communists have developed) a new form of warfare which has enabled them to render conventional military power ineffective in many situations. The new form of warfare is variously referred to as nonmilitary, political, unconventional, total, or fourth-dimensional warfare, protracted conflict, etc. \* \* \* Communist capabilities in this new type of warfare are the result of a massive development and training program which began decades ago, in secret, conspiratorial meeting and has been continued in and through a vast network of so-called political warfare or political training schools."

"The challenge to the United States and its allies today is not to atomize the military installations and capital cities of world communism. Rather, it is to meet the Communists on all fields of battle in this new form of warfare and emerge victorious in order that nuclear war may be prevented \* \* \*. (The United States) has led the organization and development of the free world's military \* \* \*. It is imperative that it now take the lead in developing its total defense by closing the serious gap that exists on the front which \* \* \* could be as decisive as the military front \* \* \*. It is essential that a thoroughgoing program of research, education, and training in the area of Communist political warfare be established."

Developments in world affairs since Senator MUNDT started his campaign for the Freedom Academy bill should strengthen the support for it.

Many Americans would like to see Congress approve the bill without further delay.

### Military Construction Appropriation Bill,

1966

#### SPEECH

OF

**HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10323) making

appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, last November the Department of Defense announced closure of several bases. Among them was an Air Force radar station at Naselle in Pacific County in my congressional district in the State of Washington.

The contemplated closure of this 13-year-old Naselle air base will remove from Pacific County 180 military and 20 civilian workers and their families with a payroll of more than \$1 million—about 8 percent of the annual nonfarm income.

Estimates indicate that about 350 persons will be affected. Naselle School District will lose 81 students and undoubtedly also will lose Federal payments for their education as other school districts have lost such funds when defense bases have been deactivated.

Total population of Pacific County in 1964 was approximately 14,000 and the loss of the personnel now manning and serving Naselle Radar Station will mean that a substantial percentage of the population will be lost to this area.

For many years Pacific County has been one of the depressed areas under the criteria developed by the Area Development Administration. On February 1, the unemployment rate was approximately 17 percent. It has not risen above that mark for more than a few months in the last decade. Thus, the significance of the radar site at Naselle to the economic health of the community is readily apparent.

The Air Force invested considerable money in this installation. It must be presumed that its technicians knew what they were doing when in 1950 this base was built as an aircraft control and warning installation on top of a 2,000-foot mountain at a cost of about \$6 million. These technicians must have known also what they were doing when an additional \$650,000 was invested to convert the equipment to a SAGE heavy radar site.

Again, the Air Force technicians must have known what they were doing when in 1962 a further sum of \$72,000 was invested in an improved communications system which was placed in service on November 15, 1962.

Further confidence in the Naselle site was evidenced by the Air Force when in 1963 the Naselle site was selected as a key link in the improved communications system now being built by the Air Force.

At this time, we should be reminded, also, that this Naselle Air Radar Station has an outstanding record. It has been operating when others in the immediate vicinity had broken down or in some way had failed to carry out their intended mission.

Consistently, the efficiency of the base has ranked high among similar installations.

I would like also to quote from a letter I received from Mr. Carlton Appelo, manager of the Western Wahkiakum County Telephone Co., dated January 18, 1965:

Alleviation of America's great social problems, however, is a matter of the head as well as the heart. And we can't help feeling like passengers on a bus whose driver is vague on just where he's going, but is hell-bent to get there.

Considering the speed with which this legislation went through the Congress it can also be reasonably said that the questions raised by this editorial have not been fully considered. In addition, the magnitude of the commitment to Vietnam is a new element that must be weighed into any discussion of legislation which will increase expenditures.

Before Congress is asked to expand or create new legislation in these areas it was recommended that the questions raised by this editorial be given utmost consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

**GREAT SOCIETY BLUEPRINT NEEDED**

When President Johnson signed the \$7.5 billion housing bill Tuesday, he promised still further steps to "lift off the conscience of our affluent Nation the shame of slums and squalor, and the blight of deterioration and decay."

His remarks were directed to housing and urban renewal, but they also reflect Mr. Johnson's broader determination that this year's harvest of Great Society legislation is only the first installment.

Presidential task forces are already out scouting for ideas on what problems should become the next targets of concern by a benevolent Washington.

When Mr. Johnson speaks of building a better America, one in which the poor and disadvantaged can increasingly share, he is stating goals to which all compassionate citizens can subscribe.

Alleviation of America's great social problems, however, is a matter of the head as well as the heart. And we can't help feeling like passengers on a bus whose driver is vague on just where he's going, but is hell-bent to get there.

After years of argument reaching back into the New Deal, medicare and Federal aid to education have been voted into law. Enactment of rent subsidies, and creation of the Job Corps and related programs, mark an unprecedented enlargement of Federal responsibilities.

Now the President is promising more of the same, while searching out new programs to make America a more pleasant, as well as more universally prosperous, place to live.

The Times has given qualified support to most components of President Johnson's war on poverty, and we applaud his efforts to lift up the quality of American life.

However, aside from the question of whether some of these activities are better left to the States and cities, we are bothered by the atmosphere of haste, and the lack of any clear idea of just what Mr. Johnson's Great Society will look like when it's completed.

Does the President intend for medicare coverage to be extended later to lower age groups? (No one knows now what the present measure will cost.)

What is the measure of inadequate housing? Since there will always be some people who have poorer housing than others, at what point does the rent subsidy program stop?

Politics being what it is, it is naive to expect answers to these questions and others.

But surely this is a time for consolidation rather than motion for motion's sake.

The Vietnam war, inevitably, will compete for funds to a degree still to be determined. Then, too, the administration could keep

itself gainfully occupied for some time just straightening out the kinks in programs enacted this year—the well-intentioned but poorly planned war on poverty being the prime example.

**Is Udall Scalping the Indians?**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to find that gradually the newspapers are beginning to criticize some of the actions of this administration in order that their readers may have an opportunity to see both sides of these questions. Friday evening in the Washington Star James J. Kilpatrick sets forth a situation concerning one of our Indian tribes and what the Secretary of the Interior has in mind in promoting public power to the disadvantage of the Indians.

On July 29th the Portland Oregonian had an editorial entitled "Hazard of Lying," which is most interesting. These two articles follow:

[From the Washington Star]  
IS UDALL SCALPING THE INDIANS?

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Getting back to Stewart Udall:

In June, the Secretary of the Interior distinguished himself, if that is the right verb, by filing with the Federal Power Commission one of the most remarkable petitions for intervention ever filed with that body. His object is to prevent the Duke Power Co. from investing its own money, to build its own dams, on its own property in South Carolina; his idea is to compel the company to rely instead upon a Federal power project on the Savannah River—a project that may never be authorized at all.

In July, the Secretary did it again. This time his target is the Montana Power Co. and the circumstances here are more outrageous still. Udall's object in Montana, unless he has changed his mind in the last 8 months, is to prevent the construction of two dams on the Flathead River in the Flathead Indian Reservation, in order to keep alive his ambition to see the Knowles project built with Federal funds.

The controversy in Montana, stemming from development of the Columbia River Basin, is of ancient vintage.

Briefly, the facts are that the Army Engineers want to build for the Bureau of Reclamation a high-level storage dam at Knowles, in the northwestern corner of the State. The structure is a power project; virtually no benefits are claimed for flood control or recreation. While only 256,000 kilowatts would be generated at the site, the dam's usefulness in regulating water flow would firm up the capacities of other structures downstream. In testimony before a House committee in June of 1963, Udall strongly endorsed the project. The Senate, under the urging of Mike Mansfield, went along with him; but the House repudiated the venture overwhelmingly in December 1963.

Opponents of the Knowles project made a solid case. The dam would cost somewhere between \$273 million and \$325 million, without counting payments that would have to be made to the affected Indian tribes. It would take 59,000 acres of land off local

tax rolls, flood 9,000 acres of irrigated farmland, inundate a part of the famed National Bison Range, displace 1,300 persons, and require the relocation of 35 miles of railroad and 115 miles of highway. By the most conservative estimates, the project's annual costs would be \$11 million, its annual revenues only \$2.3 million. Conceivably, the annual losses could run much higher—in the neighborhood of \$12 to \$14 million a year, or \$1.24 billion over the Army Engineers' 100-year estimated life.

Fifteen months passed. In March of this year, the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, in conjunction with Montana Power Co., filed an unprecedented application with the FPC. They themselves proposed to build the two alternate dams on the Flathead River, on sites that would be flooded if Knowles were ever built. These two run-of-the-river dams would cost only \$42 million; they would generate 240,000 kilowatts; guaranteed revenue from sale of the power to the Montana Power Co. would pay off the indebtedness and produce an income to the tribe of at least \$250,000 a year. Only a handful of persons would be displaced. Jobs would be created during construction for 300 men. And annual taxes would be created of \$2,772,000.

On July 28 Udall intervened, with the evident purpose of stopping the Indians' venture in private capital and self-help.

One final note: These Indians are Udall's wards. He has the fiduciary responsibility for protecting their rights under a treaty dating from 1855. But wearing his other hat, as boss of the Bureau of Reclamation, he proposed to compel them to give up a large part of their reservation, to accept unstated compensation for the flooding that would be caused by Knowles, and to sacrifice the substantial income that would result from the Montana Power Co. contract. This is power madness. It is a cruel scalping of the Indians—and of the taxpayers, too.

[From the Portland Oregonian, July 29, 1965]  
HAZARD OF LIVING

As this newspaper said at the time, no one believed that Averell Harriman, the durable troubleshooter for American Presidents, had gone to Moscow for a vacation, as he and the State Department and President Johnson insisted.

What purpose was served by this fiction we are unable to discern. The State Department now has admitted that it paid the expenses of its Ambassador at large, not only on his visit to Moscow but on his trips to other European capitals. As well it should, inasmuch as Mr. Harriman was sent to these capitals to discuss Vietnam and related problems with Soviet and other national leaders.

It is irritating, frustrating and harmful to public confidence that official Washington—including the President—increasingly resorts to evasions, distortions and outright lies when no national security purpose is served thereby. Americans may ask, if the administration will lie about such a little thing, how can we trust it to tell the truth about something really vital?

*Sp. Matsunaga*

The Honolulu Advertiser Supports President's Decision on Vietnam

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the various alternatives on the Vietnam sit-

A4552

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 16, 1965

uation are the subject of editorial comment in the July 29 issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, one of the leading newspapers in Hawaii.

Pointing out that there are no "good" alternatives, the editor of the Honolulu daily expresses the belief that the course the President has decided upon is keeping hope alive for successful peace talks.

I commend for thoughtful reading by all the Honolulu Advertiser's editorial, which follows:

## VIETNAM: THE DECISION

It's been said many times there are no good alternatives in Vietnam. And once again President Johnson has chosen the best of them.

His decision is, in effect, to pursue more of the same. This involves holding the line with more troops to prevent a disastrous defeat while pursuing peace talks even harder.

There are many important fine points involved in the Vietnam situation. But essentially the other alternatives to the President's decision were:

A decision to withdraw that would leave non-Communist Vietnamese without any bargaining power or support in the face of a victorious Vietcong, or the launching of a major effort that might seem to us a holy war against Communist expansion but would be viewed by many as an American onslaught on Asians.

The President's decision has something for both doves and hawks. Yet is unlikely to satisfy those at the extremes of both positions.

And it must be admitted that the action he outlined—taken after a week of intensive conferences—continues a policy that has not worked well so far.

Despite all efforts to date, the Communists have continued both to win the war and reject what the President says are "13 peace offensives" he has launched.

But, if present policy is continuing, it is hoped the intensified efforts will produce results.

On the military front, the basic job is still to prevent further Vietcong gains and to shore up the South Vietnamese military.

The President called a new buildup to 125,000 combat troops a "carefully measured" response. However, most reports indicate this figure will have to go higher if any kind of line is to be held.

The negotiations front is equally uncertain, and it too may require additional moves before there are any results.

The President said he was launching a drive for peace talks that would seek help in the United Nations and from any other source. To date the Communists have shown nothing but quick rejection or silent disdain for any third-party efforts.

Their minimum conditions seem to be a halt to the bombings in North Vietnam and insistence that we deal with the Vietcong directly, instead of the Hanoi regime as we have demanded.

The President did not say anything yesterday about a halt to the bombings of the north. But, contrary to what some may think, halting the bombings is not a magic formula that will produce peace talks. Presumably, it is something we would be glad to do, if there was any sign other conditions were favorable.

There was clearly some "give" in the President's press conference statement on dealing with the Vietcong. He said, in effect, this matter should present no problem.

The next few days or weeks should tell whether the chances for peace talks have been increased by both the President's public statements and any private actions being taken. (It is important to realize that almost certainly the week of discussion will

also lead to some private actions not discussed at the press conference.)

One such possibility is referred to by Walter Lippmann writing in the current Newsweek, in which he argues for a defensive strategy as announced by the President yesterday. He says:

"We must not fool ourselves, however, about the probable consequences of a decision to adopt a defensive strategy.

"It would be a signal to the South Vietnamese that the time has come for them to move toward peace negotiations with their fellow Vietnamese.

"They would be on notice that we shall remain to defend them from personal disaster, but that they must not count upon us to win for them the war they have not been able, with immense assistance from us, to win for themselves."

On the basis of experience to date, it is hard to be optimistic about a successful outcome in Vietnam soon. It may be a very long effort—and the way is still open for it to lead to a major war.

But the President's decision has also kept hope alive.

which were showered on former Vice President Richard Nixon when he visited the country in 1959.

The Nixon visit was preceded by a few weeks by a tour of Warsaw by former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. For the latter visit, Poles were ordered out on the street and instructed to throw flowers purchased by the Government.

The American visit was not announced by the Polish Government, but it was broadcast by Radio Free Europe. Almost half a million Poles turned out voluntarily and threw flowers until the Nixon car was literally full.

Poles stood on the street cheering and crying. They defied police lines to touch those in the American party.

The demonstration came as a shock to the Communist Government.

In April, the new Soviet leaders, Leonid Brezhnev and Alexei Kosygin visited Warsaw to mark 20 years of Polish-Soviet friendship and sign a new treaty. Again the Soviets received a cold welcome from the Polish people.

There seems good reason to believe that an American visit would have again provoked great warmth.

The friendship of the Polish people for the United States is not based on foreign aid or government negotiation. Basically, it reflects the fact that one out of every four Polish families has American relatives. And the hatred of both Russia and Germany still is strong in Poland.

In June, Waladyslaw Gomulka, the veteran Communist Party boss, was reelected by a 99.3 percent vote on a single-slate ballot. But he is a tough realist who knows this is not a popular mandate. And in the past year he has tightened up government control and added restrictions against the Catholic Church which he once tolerated.

It is interesting that, even at this time, Gomulka fears a demonstration for an American official.

In view of this, there is no reason for more funds to support a Communist government. But there would appear to be an opportunity to use the hospital as a propaganda theme of hope for the Polish people.

Our broadcasts should hail the hospital as a sign that this nation still hopes the Poles eventually will be free of oppression. They should stress the refusal to allow Americans to visit Poland officially. They should offer hope.

Where there is little else, hope can be a big thing.

## Do What Grandma Did

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Jack P. Harris, publisher of the Hutchinson, Kans., News, which considers one of the important issues relating to the omnibus farm bill scheduled for debate in the House this week. The column, entitled "Do What Grandma Did," follows:

## Do WHAT GRANDMA DID

I first became conscious of the price of bread when I was given a nickel and sent down to the bakery to get a loaf. It was well worth the money. It was usually still warm from the oven, had crunchy crust, and gave

The last is a relatively new area for Presidential leadership. But it emerged as a crucial area with the development of full-scale modern industrialism and came to crisis with the great depression—which the American people are determined never to let happen again.

Economics has persisted as an area of Presidential concern in a society in which some critical problems can better be solved by high-level decisionmakers, in Government and business, rather than being left to the "marketplace"—or to accident or fate. Wherever possible, however, it makes good sense to let competition in the marketplace and consumers' choices determine economic activity.

How tension helps: One of the great advantages of a free society is that, though one respects one's political chief, one must not necessarily do what he says. Businessmen have a different perspective from government, and society's ends—"the public interest"—may often be best promoted by a tension between business and government. Tensions and conflicts may be as constructive for the broad society as within any single organization.

But they may sometimes become destructive. The endless problem, within an organization or society as a whole, is to find a balance—to permit tensions, but set limits on conflict lest it become ruinous.

Role for business: The problems of avoiding excessive power for the business corporations are as worthy of concern as is limiting the power of government. There are inherent restrictions, however, for the corporation is not the only significant or powerful institution today. Labor unions in many respects provide a useful check on the power of both business and government. So do farm groups, universities, foundations, professional organizations, racial and religious groups, even family.

The corporation may unavoidably be involved in moral issues, but it cannot presume to replace the churches, or the conscience of the individual. Nor can the corporation be mother and father to its employees. A free society is a pluralistic society—one in which no one institution (or one political party) can be all-powerful and controlling.

Yet businessmen today are increasingly coming to understand that they do have considerable power and that they can play—as heads of huge organizations—a major role in shaping the fortunes of a free society.

#### *The best way to keep business free*

(Note.—Thomas J. Watson, Jr., the chairman of International Business Machines Corp., sees a more active social role for business as a way to avoid Government controls that might hurt efficiency.)

"Government controls have slowly encroached on business in the United States—and most of these have been correct. The pattern of Government control of European industries, however, is far more extensive. U.S. industry is less fettered than any other by a long, long shot. That is why our industry is so strong here. Our success is related to the speed of the decision process.

"Business must seek to measure up to its social responsibilities as a means of preserving its independence and efficiency. Indeed, that is what 'social responsibility' means—it is a way of avoiding direct Government control. Fortunately, over the past few decades business has made this a good public relations thing; people buy products that way, given a choice. Under the specter of war, business becomes liberal as hell. \* \* \*

"I would not recommend any institutional change in our system as long as things are going as well as they are. But Government must be prepared to move, when necessary. It should let business do its damnedest, but it's got to peg certain things, and when the statistics approach or exceed the limits, you

must take action. For instance, on unemployment, I think Secretary of Labor Bill Wirtz' peg should be below where it is. Industry can help out there—and on anti-poverty programs, too. Similarly, on the balance of payments. There's no conflict here with the quest for better long-term profits."

*See On Multer*  
**The President Makes Policy Plain on**

**Vietnam**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### **HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by William S. White from the August 2, 1965, edition of the New York Journal-American. The President has made our policy in Vietnam plain. The United States is committed to uphold its pledge made by three American Presidents to the people of South Vietnam. We seek an end to aggression, and the achievement of an honorable peace. It is our country's responsibility and duty to be in Vietnam, and this is what President Johnson made plain to the Nation.

The article follows:

#### L.B.J. MAKES POLICY PLAIN ON VIETNAM

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—As the fog of war thickens over Vietnam, other fogs of quite different ilk are lifting here at home. The national atmosphere is burned free of a great deal of vaporous nonsense.

No longer can it be denied by any responsible public official or private man that the most vital American interests are involved in this struggle against Asian Communist aggression. If 125,000 American troops in Vietnam are not enough to give somber refutation to this sort of pell-mell, there is in addition the solemn declaration of the President of the United States: "This is really war."

No longer can it be suggested by any responsible American that this country is somehow unreasonably refusing to negotiate with a Communist invader who a score of times has scorned any honorable discussion—and still does.

No longer can it be suggested by any responsible American that the purposes and motives of the United States in Asia are somehow hidden and tricky and that the people of the United States are terribly, terribly confused.

The position of the Government of the United States has, in President Johnson's address to the Nation by way of his press conference, again and for the umpteenth time been made plain as the noonday sun. We are determined to honor the pledges of three American Presidents to the people of South Vietnam. We seek no melodramatic total victory. We seek only an end to aggression and invasion and a decent peace decently guaranteed. But these aims we not merely pursue but also demand; and these aims we shall achieve, come what might.

Of all the moonshine so long spread by avowedly liberal splinters in the Senate and House, none has been more persistently spread than the claim that American aims are somehow tricky and that the American public is somehow in the dark. If American aims in fact suffer for credibility, it is

from their simplicity and—yes—their honesty and altruism in a world where pseudosophisticates are forever on the lookout for the gimmick and the clever phrase to mask candid intentions.

As to the American public, there has not been the smallest objective evidence of confusion as to what this Nation is about in Asia. Every national poll has clearly shown that the people know quite well what we are about and that while, of course, they are not madly gay about it, they fully recognize its necessities.

To this, this columnist can add a personal note. In a 2 weeks' absence from Washington "out in the country" it seemed plain that the only people really confused are that minority of beat beaters in Congress who profess confusion to avoid facing up to the truth that we are in Vietnam simply because it is our duty to be there as the leader and guardian of the free world.

There is a time for the fullest debate and for the longest and most pompous teach-ins. And these, heaven knows, we have had in full measure. Then there is a time for a halt to logic-chopping and emotionalized appeals for a "peace" that would mean surrender and betrayal of our responsibilities on this earth. This time has now arrived. For now the United States of America is at war.

#### Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965

#### SPEECH OF

#### **HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my support of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and urge its passage.

This act provides needed sources of financial aid for helping certain local areas in their efforts to attract and stimulate private industries.

This legislation will help to achieve the goals set forth in the President's state of the Union message:

Our basic task is threefold: to keep our economy growing; to open for all Americans the opportunity that is now enjoyed by most Americans; and to improve the quality of life for all.

The programs provided by this act represent an investment in a better, stronger America. These are not programs for giveaways—these are programs for hope.

The Area Redevelopment and Accelerated Public Works programs, the forerunners of this legislation now before us, demonstrated the effectiveness of a broad scale attack on the problems of areas of economic stress. I know from personal experience how valuable the Area Redevelopment Act program has been to Newark, N.J., in its determined

August 16, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4565

erty rights of their owner stockholders. Not today.

"The property rights in question today are those of the active property of the separate corporate persons, not the passive stocks of the owners. Pope John XXIII, in his historic Encyclical Letter *Mater et Magistra*, clearly establishes the role of this right of property: \*\*\* in the right of private property there is rooted a social responsibility \*\*\* the overall supply of goods is assigned first of all that all men may lead a decent life."

"Thus we return to the doctrine of mutual consent that freedom is a compact between men to restrain from so behaving as to destroy each other's freedom. Applied within the corporation, we see that all the forces necessary for the continuation of the corporation's function, labor, capital, and management, are in a compact of mutual consent to so act as to respect each other's minimum freedoms.

"The corporation is also in a compact with the society which created it. The society, which recognizes the corporation's right to private property, will tolerate the private ownership of the means of production as long as the corporation produces the minimum socially and economically needed good.

"For too long we have hidden the \*\*\* dynamic power of our free enterprise system to create good, social and economic good, under \*\*\* our obsolete theories of business. For too long we have fed ammunition to our enemies, the prophets of class warfare, by insisting on the selfish motivations of antagonistic classical capitalism, rather than preaching the proven success of our mutual consent, cooperative free enterprise system."

## VII. A NEW STRUCTURE—AND NEW LEADERSHIP

In the American society today, no longer is there a simple division between power (meaning political authority) and property (meaning business interests). The concept of property itself has been drastically modified by the rise of the great corporation and the wide diffusion of ownership and control of the means of production, both through financial institutions and through the political process.

Many institutions—labor unions, racial and religious groups, the press, scientists and intellectuals, as well as political parties and their leaders—have some degree of power to influence the course of American life. The business corporation clearly does not bestride U.S. society like a top-hatted Wall Street banker in a cartoon in *Pravda* or *Izvestia*. Yet few would deny it has a crucial role to play.

The ancient cold war between business and government is breaking up—on both sides. The new partnership is still in process of evolution. There is always the possibility—some would say probability—that it will collapse under fresh political, economic, or social pressures. Certainly, the U.S. business community, which is far from unified, does not feel itself committed to any one party's, or any one man's, concept of the Great Society.

Yet there are reasons for thinking that the kind of restructuring of business-government power relations that is going on in the United States represents a genuine change in the workings of the system.

Worldwide: For one thing, what is going on in the United States is only a manifestation of changes at work in all modern industrial societies throughout the world. As Duke University's Calvin B. Hoover puts it:

"The experience of all modern industrialized societies demonstrates that some sort of new 'mix' of the responsibilities and functions of the state, of economic organizations, and of individuals essentially different from that of capitalism of the past is inevitable."

Every Western democracy is striving to

discover for itself the means of achieving a better balance between private and public responsibilities in solving key problems. There are parallels between the President's Council of Economic Advisers and his Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Relations, and the new Department of Economic Affairs and the National Economic Development Council in Britain, or the Economic and Social Council in France.

The U.S. way: No two nations are tackling these problems in quite same way. The U.S. Government still plays a less controlling role in industry than do governments in other countries. U.S. industry, says Thomas J. Watson, Jr.—whose IBM Corp. operates in many countries—is still "less fettered than in any other country, by a long, long shot."

This, he thinks, is a major reason why U.S. industry is so strong and innovative. U.S. industrial success, as he sees it, is closely related to "the speed of the decision process."

The willingness of private business voluntarily to work with Government is, in Watson's view and that of a growing number of other business leaders, a way to retain their present degree of freedom and to avoid what they fear will be inefficient or wrongheaded Government controls.

Formidable: The technical and operating problems facing businessmen who would measure up to the needs of the time are formidable. They may range from fiscal and monetary policy to urban renewal to race relations to problems of national defense and the uses of outer space—and, of course, a knowledge of how to run their own businesses successfully in a period of explosive technological change.

The education of tomorrow's business leaders will have to offer better preparation for such a wide range of problems than the education—and experiences—afforded the present generation of business leaders.

Models: Some business leaders of today, however, do provide models of how to serve the interests of private business and the broad society. One such man is Robert A. Lovett—banker, World War I Navy hero, World War II public official, Secretary of Defense under President Truman, and a leading candidate for inclusion in the mythical "U.S. establishment."

Says Lovett: "The corporation should not seek to replace public authority. Yet the corporation is endowed with the public interest—a bit. It is created by the state, and it must be responsible \*\*\*."

Democracy, Lovett adds, requires that freedom be coupled with restraint. There is no simple formula for this, he concedes, but says: "I can't believe that there is not enough wisdom or wit in this country so that we can handle our problems within a context of freedom."

There is growing support within the U.S. business community for such views.

## VIII. THE HARD CHOICE THAT FACES BUSINESS

It is becoming clear that what U.S. business faces today is a set of choices on the role it is to play in relation to the broad society. Business cannot avoid the necessity of choice, because the modern corporation has become the towering institution of today's society—and the problems of society have become its problems as well.

The society is demanding the achievement of a great many national objectives—national security (which inescapably involves the corporation), maximum employment, racial equality, rising living standards (especially for groups left behind in the growth race), improved education, better medical care, a healthier urban environment, the safeguarding of natural resources.

Two roads: In attempting to achieve those ends, which involve overlapping business and Government functions and responsibilities, there are two basic choices:

To increase the role of Government and, where business is concerned, to make greater

use of coercion or fiat to bring about the kind of business behavior desired.

To seek to develop more fruitful, voluntary cooperation between business and Government.

Either approach has obvious dangers.

The first may involve excessive centralization of power in the Government, posing genuine threats to the freedom and efficiency of business, and to society itself.

The second may be too loose and uncertain, and can scarcely avoid the problem of sanctions against "chiselers," or simply hard-pressed businesses that are not able to measure up to the standards of social responsibility assumed by large and prosperous corporations.

No "either-or": But the choice is not a simple either-or decision.

Indeed, the success or failure of the voluntary approach in particular areas will largely determine whether the coercive role of Government is to be closely limited or greatly expanded.

And how far government intervenes in the economy or in social relations will depend heavily on its ability to create conditions making for a healthy and growing over-all economy.

There are two reasons to hope that, thanks to progress in the understanding and use of fiscal and monetary policy by government, the detailed decisions on production, distribution, employment, location of industry, and such matters can on the whole be handled by business on its own.

Yet specific problems have emerged—and others will continue to develop—that require business and government cooperation, or legislative solution.

Today, some of these issues involve collective bargaining and strike threats in key industries, the Nation's balance of payments, race relations, unemployment, poverty, urban decay. What specifically the critical issues of the future will be no one can know for sure.

Cautions: Just as they do today, viewpoints in the future are bound to differ on the gravity or nature of particular problems and on how to deal with them. These viewpoints will be colored in part by the interests of the parties that are involved and by their ideologies—including interests and ideologies of government officials and their academic or other allies, as well as those of business.

That means it will be vitally important to guard, on the one hand, against the notion that "the public interest" is always best defined and understood by public officials. The power of the state, as Calvin B. Hoover warns, "cannot automatically be assumed to be wielded in the public interest."

On a host of matters, businessmen must be free to make their own decisions, or society will suffer. They should not—as one of them recently told the President—he treated "like children."

At the same time, some businessmen point out, it cannot automatically be assumed that whatever the President, or other government policymakers, propose is damaging to business interests. Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., in thinking back over the forces that prompted the growth of his own giant corporation, has stressed that one of the most essential factors—besides technical innovation and entrepreneurial drive—was "the public consensus, the political decision."

Leadership and economics: The U.S. system puts heavy responsibility on the Federal Government, and the President in particular; and the American people have come to expect Presidents to exert leadership whenever and wherever national problems are serious—whether in matters of national defense, foreign affairs, race relations, or economic affairs.

I am pleased to note that the drum corps movement has grown in recent years and is by now attracting a million young people. National Drum Corps Week is aimed to bring to attention of the American people this very important and effective youth activity. At the same time, it serves as an encouragement to our youth and to the very fine contribution they are making to our way of life. This movement deserves the support and cooperation of all Americans.

### Midway Ready for New Life With Jet Set

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1965*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wayne Thomis, distinguished aviation editor of the Chicago Tribune, has written an excellent article in today's edition of the Tribune which outlines in considerable detail the return of major airline operations to Chicago's Midway Airport.

This should be good news to millions of Americans who have, during the past few months, suffered considerable delays in both arriving and departing from Chicago's O'Hare Field, now operating at peak capacity.

I am sure this will also be welcome news to the Members of Congress who use Chicago as a transfer point on their trips to and from their respective districts. The resumption of major airline operations at Midway, which has been almost deserted since 1962 when the airlines moved most of their operations to O'Hare, is a major victory for Mayor Richard Daley.

It has been the mayor's persistent and untiring negotiations with the major airlines which today brings within sight of reality the reopening of Midway to major airline traffic. Mayor Daley long ago realized that Chicago had to have two major airports to serve the airlines of America if Chicago was to continue as the transportation center of the world.

With the development of O'Hare, most of the major airlines shifted their operations from Midway in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Midway, once the world's busiest airport, had to yield that title to O'Hare during the past 3 years.

O'Hare Field today handles in excess of 1,400 flight operations daily. Mr. Thomis' excellent article discusses in considerable detail the plans that the major airlines have to restore major activities at Midway. Mr. Thomis points out that one of the factors in speeding resumption of major operations at Midway is the anticipation that short-runway jets will be permitted by the Federal Aviation Agency to operate into and out of Washington's National Airport in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I find particular satisfaction in this development, for many of my colleagues will recall I had been

carrying on a concerted effort for some time to obtain approval from the FAA for operation of short-runway jets at Washington National Airport.

It is my sincere hope that as soon as the current survey being conducted at National Airport is completed, such approval will be granted. There can be no doubt that the Nation's Capital cannot be denied short-runway jet service much longer.

I am particularly hopeful that the new FAA Administrator, Mr. McKee, will understand the impressive service that can be performed to millions of American air travelers by permitting jet transportation into Midway with the least possible delay.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomis' excellent article follows:

**MIDWAY READY FOR NEW LIFE WITH JET SET—  
AIR LINES TO SHIFT FLIGHTS THERE**

(By Wayne Thomas)

With the return to central standard time and the winter air traffic season, Midway airport will regain an important segment of scheduled airline services, the Tribune has learned.

These will include short-range flights to the Southeast, Florida, the Southwest through St. Louis and Dallas, the Northwest, and the west coast through Omaha and Denver. Both piston-engined and jet airliners will be rescheduled to operate through Midway, deserted since 1962.

#### GRADUAL SHIFT OF FLIGHTS

Among the major carriers which are expected to provide these services are United Air Lines, American Airlines, Trans World Airlines, and Northwest Airlines, Inc. As soon as these large carriers are operating from Midway, there will be a gradual shifting of other flights from the dangerously overcrowded ramps and loading gateways at O'Hare International Airport, the major jet terminal, according to reliable information.

It is understood that Mayor Daley soon will announce the "return to Midway" to the city council. This is expected to coincide with release of schedules by United Air Lines for 18 to 25 daily flights from Midway, about 5 percent of their total operations at O'Hare Field.

Next in line is expected to be Northwest Orient Airlines, which has been parking its 707, 720, and 727 jets two deep at its O'Hare gates in peak traffic periods. A return to Midway with some of Northwest's 727 and Electra flights will reduce the pressures at O'Hare and broaden the company's Chicago market.

#### TWA TELLS PLANS

Trans World Airlines has written the city administration that it intends to return service to Midway Airport, but there are no details. TWA has 727 jets—fully approved for Midway and in twice daily service there by United Air Lines for more than a year—and can offer New York, Kansas City, Philadelphia, and west coast trips from Midway.

American Airlines management, which spearheaded the air carrier opposition to earlier city efforts to restore services to Midway, "has softened" toward Midway, the Tribune learned.

Both American, with British 111 small twinjet planes due for delivery late this year; and TWA, with Douglas DC-9 twinjets also to be delivered this fall and early in 1966, will have equipment ideally suited to 5,000-foot runway airports. Midway's diagonal landing strips are both in the 6,000-feet-class.

#### FAA STUDY IN WASHINGTON

Part of the airlines' willingness to return to Midway can be traced to the Federal

Aviation Agency's study of restoring regular airline jet services to Washington National Airport. Washington National is nearer the city, while the newer Dulles field and Baltimore's Friendship Airport are farther away.

As soon as jet service is restored to National—in September or October, depending on results of the study—United will schedule 727 jets from Chicago, probably from Midway, into National airport.

American Airlines, which has kept Electra flights from O'Hare into National, will have to meet United's service with jets of its own.

With National open, United is expected to exploit Midway, La Guardia in New York, Washington's National to the utmost.

At city hall, officials were told by United that the company "never expected to make a profit at Midway airport" with the two trips to New York and two to Washington it has operated for 14 months.

### Got It in the Neck

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, August 16, 1965*

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the Members will be interested in the following interesting column by the distinguished Lyle C. Wilson, which appeared in the Washington Daily News, August 12, 1965:

#### GOT IT IN THE NECK

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

We, the people, got it in the neck last week in a lost cause effort to remind President Johnson and his Great Society Senators that the United States was set up to be a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

We got it when these Senators voted against this American system. The vote came on a proposal by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN to submit to a continuing vote of the people of each State the question whether both houses of its legislature should or should not be apportioned according to the Supreme Court's remarkable rule that population must be the sole determining factor.

The Court ruled last year against apportionment of one house on the basis of geography or other characteristics not directly related to population. In his dissent from this rule by Chief Justice Earl Warren and the Court majority, Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter warned of danger ahead. Justice Frankfurter said that if the Federal judiciary involved itself in this essentially political problem of determining the relationship between population and representation, it would generate friction and tension in Federal-State relations. That tension and friction are now present.

Senator DIRKSEN's proposal for a continuing plebiscite on representation in each State was the American way. He merely sought to appeal the question to the court of last resort—the people. His amendment would have provided:

That an apportionment plan based on any factor other than population would have had to be approved by the voters of the State.

That any nonpopulation plan submitted to the voters would be accompanied by an alternative plan substantially based on equality of population to assure the voters a choice.

August 16, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4569

**The Ming Quong Children's Center****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Ming Quong Children's Center, one of the finest organizations dedicated to the assistance of mankind and little children in particular, is located in the heart of my congressional district.

The Ming Quong Children's Center in Los Gatos, Calif., is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. Its purpose throughout these years has been to help troubled children of California. The old Chinese gate which marks the entrance to the center is a symbol of a half-century of this open door policy.

The Ming Quong Center goes deeply into California history. It grew out of a rescue mission home in San Francisco for Chinese slave girls who had been brought to this country at the turn of the century. The story of the dedicated women of the Occidental Board, who founded the mission, and Miss Donaldina Cameron and her assistants, who accounted for the rescue of over 1,000 slave girls, is one of the West's most exciting tales.

It began in 1915, under its present name, as a custodial home for Chinese orphans—little girls who had been abandoned with no parents to care for them or who were being used as domestic drudges. This was not unusual in the old Chinese culture. Girls had no value even for the families which had migrated to the United States.

Ming Quong—translated “radiant light”—came into being when it was decided that it was unwise to house the small girls with the older ones who had been former slave girls. Capt. Robert Dollar, of the Dollar Steamship Lines, gave them property—which is now part of the Mills College campus in Oakland, Calif.—for a home for 60 younger girls. In 1935 the need was felt to remove the girls to warm, sunny Los Gatos as many of the children had been exposed to tuberculosis and were undernourished. The work with both boys and girls continued as a mission station of the board of national missions of the United Presbyterian Church.

Today, Ming Quong performs as great a service in meeting modern day needs as it did 50 years ago. Now it is a residential treatment agency for emotionally disturbed boys and girls of all races and creeds. The children live in cottages each with its own houseparents. A highly-trained staff of therapist-social workers, psychologists and a consulting psychiatrist work as a team to solve the problems of these unfortunate children who are innocent victims of circumstances beyond their control. They also work with the parents whenever possible to try to solve family problems.

Ming Quong is now reaching into the community to develop all types of com-

munity support and interest. Churches of all faiths instead of one, now assume their responsibility; individuals and community groups contribute time and talent; volunteer auxiliary clubs have been formed to lend effort and financial support.

Plans for a day treatment center for children who do not need residential care are under way with the public school system working closely with the center in organizing special teaching programs.

Ming Quong's first 50 years has been dedicated to meeting the needs of the times and plans for the years ahead promise this same foresighted approach. The great old Chinese gate will always be open to receive the troubled children of California.

*Charles S. Gubser*  
United States Gets Bouquet on Vietnam

**Policy****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Warren Rogers from the August 5, 1965, edition of the New York Journal-American.

United States policy in Vietnam has received support from an unexpected source. The Manila Times, generally critical of U.S. foreign policy in southeast Asia, came up with a strong defense of American actions in Vietnam in a recent article by A. L. Valencia. Mr. Valencia writes in reference to those Asians who would have the United States withdraw from Vietnam:

But should not these critics—if they are honest men—also concede that their very liberty to dissent has depended directly on American protection?

Although some Asians resent the American presence, most Asians know that that presence is all that enables them to remain free.

It is encouraging that the people of Asia have an understanding of our actions in Vietnam, and appreciate the objectives for which we are fighting. That the people closest to the conflict strongly support our policy should strengthen our resolve to stand firm in Vietnam.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES GETS BOUQUET ON VIETNAM POLICY

(By Warren Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—From time to time, it is a good idea to take a look at ourselves from the outside, to see ourselves as others see us. Sometimes, amid all the brickbats at home and abroad, we get thrown a bouquet from unexpected sources.

The Manila Times, which loves to lambaste U.S. foreign policy in southeast Asia, has done just that. In a recent article by A. L. Valencia, writing from Washington, the Times comes up with a defense of American

actions in Vietnam which is remarkable for its candor and its logic.

“Among the angry young men of southeast Asia,” Mr. Valencia writes, “it has become fashionable to attack America's actions and motives at every turn, and to applaud every American misfortune. To be able to talk back to the greatest power on earth is regarded as a badge of courage and patriotism. But should not these critics—if they are honest men—also concede that their very liberty to dissent has depended directly on American protection?

“If, as a result of shrill demands for ‘Yankee go home,’ American power were to draw back in the Pacific, the Philippines—let's face it—would be virtually defenseless.” Mr. Valencia then explores the catch phrase demanding “Asian solutions to Asian problems.” He puts it this way:

“The world is shrinking so rapidly that anybody's problem is everybody's problem. If we insist on Asian solution, it will be Asian all right, but it is most likely to be labeled ‘Made in Peiping.’”

Mr. Valencia then notes that India, for all its dedication to Asian solutions, was quick to accept help from the West when attacked by Red China. Thailand, Laos, Nationalist China, Malaysia, Japan, and even Cambodia are not less patriotic for depending upon American friendship and power to maintain their national independence, he argues.

“To make these statements \* \* \* is not to demean national prides,” Mr. Valencia adds. “It is merely to stress a decent respect for reality.”

And the reality, as he sees it, is that most Filipinos and most Asians not under Communist domination—even though millions resent the American presence—“know that that presence is all that enables them to remain free.”

It is good to have such reminders that there is some understanding in southeast Asia of what the United States is trying to do. Granted that America's efforts are not entirely altruistic—is there any American who doubts that, if we don't fight there, we'll have to fight here?—a great measure of my brother's-keeper philosophy is involved.

**National Drum Corps Week****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the week of August 15 to 22 has been designated as National Drum Corps Week in honor of the 1 million teenagers in the United States who are associated with this colorful and wholesome activity.

On this occasion, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in Congress to pay tribute to these young people and to extend my best wishes to them for their participation in this purposeful activity. The marching and maneuvering, the bugling, and the drumming have rightfully been described as “an expression of order, color, symmetry, and beauty.”

Certainly this is a clean, interesting and inspiring activity for our youth in a confused world where youth is struggling to find a place for itself and an outlet for its zest and energy. Unfortunately, many of our young people fail to find worthwhile activities and end up as criminals and juvenile delinquents.

19782

August 16, 1965

Te (V) mle  
VIETNAM—THE REAL MEANING  
OF "UNCONDITIONAL NEGOTIA-  
TIONS"

way of life, foreign to the great history and noble traditions of our country from colonial days to the present time. Furthermore, it would be so inhuman and so callous that we as a Nation would be downgraded before all of the world, even to a greater extent than was Adolph Hitler's Germany.

The distinguished Congressman who made this bombastic speech gave little or no thought to the fact that were we to bomb the nuclear installations within the Red Chinese mainland, immediately Communist China with its population of 700 million and with its tremendously powerful land army would go to war against the United States, overrunning southeast Asia, and in doing this killing many thousands of American GI's.

Any self-respecting nation attacked in such a manner as was proposed in this Connecticut speech made by the gentleman from the other body would have no other course open to it. Furthermore, as certain as sunrise follows the sunset, the Soviet Union, obligated by its commitment and alliance to Communist China, and despite the fact that its leaders and the Russian people seek friendship and not war wth this nation, would inevitably mobilize its forces and unleash its missiles, and the third world war—and this a war on annihilation—would begin.

Mr. President, this arm-chair militarist says:

I will insist on victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable.

It would be difficult to find anywhere a more bombastic statement than that. Unfortunately, this particular arm-chair militarist has the title of chairman of a powerful committee.

The President, who is Comander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has repeatedly announced his desire and hope that representatives of the Vietcong and North Vietnam and other nations meet with us at a conference table, that we are glad to talk settlement and seek a ceasefire.

He has said time and time again—and that is our position at the present time, despite the bombast from the gentleman from the other body—that we should seek negotiations unconditionally, without any conditions whatsoever.

Our situation is bad in South Vietnam. It is far worse than it was a year ago or when President Eisenhower first committed our Armed Forces in South Vietnam. It is too late now for us to say a mistake was made, because we were committed in 1954 and we have been involved there since that time, and apparently things have gone from bad to worse.

Despite these statements that should never have been made—he said:

I will insist on victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable.

We Americans seek and hope for a negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides which will offer the Communists and Vietcong a reasonable and attractive alternative to military victory.

We seek a ceasefire and seek the time when the neighbors to the North and certain people in South Vietnam will

cease their aggression. Then we look forward to withdrawing our forces from southeast Asia.

Such a ceasefire or peace similar to that attained in South Korea is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Let us try to attain it.

I yield the floor.

#### UNIVERSITIES GROUP NOT IN COALITION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on July 7, I inserted in the RECORD—pages 15246-15247—an article from the Des Moines Register which purported to describe a coalition of organizations working together for legislative and partisan political purposes.

In a letter to the editor of the Register, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, one of the organizations included in the article, said the report as far as it was concerned was without foundation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, entitled "Universities Group Not in Coalition," from the Register of July 19, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 19, 1965]

#### UNIVERSITIES GROUP NOT IN COALITION

TO THE EDITOR:

A July 6 news story by Nick Kotz [purported] to describe a "coalition" of interest groups "working quietly behind the scenes in Congress to reelect Democratic Congressmen and to lobby for Johnson administration legislation." The name of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges was included in the list of organizations which, Mr. Kotz says, have been "meeting regularly in Washington under the chairmanship of Donald Ellinger of the Democratic National Committee."

The article is completely without foundation as far as the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges is concerned. The association has not, does not, and will not participate in partisan political activity of any kind \* \* \*.

With respect to education legislation, it has long been customary for organizations interested in this area to meet together with or without representatives of the administration currently in office \* \* \*. At no time have I or members of my staff participated in meetings of this kind at which there was discussion of or plans for support of or opposition to candidates for public office, or of proposed legislation in partisan terms.

RUSSELL I. THACKREY,  
Executive Secretary, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the Senator in charge of the bill agreed to this?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then I shall not object.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, ever since President Johnson's speech at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore on April 7, all kinds of interpretations have been made of the meaning of "unconditional negotiations"—the phrase which appeared in his address.

All peace-loving people are prayerful that there will be a prompt end to the war in Vietnam and that peace will come to that area. But few peace-loving people will tolerate an end to the war at the price of freedom or the profit for aggression. The national interest of the United States and South Vietnam—indeed the national interest of all nations, large and small, whose people live in freedom—repudiates a policy of peace at any price. There is a price to be paid for peace and it is only with a clear understanding of what that price is that those who speak of "negotiations" can speak meaningfully.

The President has emphasized on several occasions that the United States will take such action as is necessary to achieve our objectives in Vietnam. These objectives, he has pointed out, are to persuade the North Vietnamese to leave their neighbor, South Vietnam, alone—to cease and desist from directing, controlling, and supplying war materiel and manpower to the Vietcong military forces in South Vietnam; further, to assist the South Vietnamese in ending the attacks of the Vietcong so that the people can live in peace and freedom. This is the price of peace in South Vietnam.

These objectives could be achieved through peaceful negotiations—if the leaders in Hanoi were willing to pay this price. They understand very clearly that this is the price and they have to date been unwilling to pay it. They have chosen, instead, to pay a higher price by forcing South Vietnam and her allies to achieve these objectives in a war.

The President has said that "We do not intend to be defeated." This is another way of saying that we do not intend to fail in our military efforts to achieve our objectives.

The President has also stated a "win" policy for our war effort when he declared on June 1:

In the future I will call upon our people to make further sacrifices because this is a good program, and the starts we are making are good starts. This is the only way that I know in which we can really win, not only the military battle against aggression, but the wider war for the freedom and progress of all men.

Winning the military battle would naturally mean attaining our objectives.

I might point out that earlier this year Secretary of State Rusk stated that we are going to help the South Vietnamese win the war.

There are some who say that no one ever wins a war. While it is true that war brings great hardship and suffering, it is not true that the objectives stated by the President of the United States cannot be won. They are moral objec-

Judge Burnett, in other words, that the temper and personality traits of this particular trial judge were as well known before his appointment by the President and his confirmation by the Senate, as now, and therefore that must be what was wanted.

Let me say to the distinguished lawyer who made those remarks that "that" most certainly was not what was wanted, not by the Senate and certainly not by anybody concerned with the honor and fairness of our judicial system.

Let me say to the Senate that this man's term expires next year and that this Senator from Alaska is irrevocably committed to oppose any attempt by this man to seek another term on the bench of this or any other court.

His behavior, his inexcusable manner, his utter disregard for the interests of the children whose parents come before him—due apparently to his strange and fitful obsession—make him unfit to wear the judicial robe.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

**MR. LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 2283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Senate will resume consideration of the bill.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

**MR. LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**MR. YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President—

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Will the Senator from Louisiana withhold his request?

**MR. LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

#### UNTHINKABLE THAT THIS NATION WOULD DESTROY COMMUNIST CHINA'S NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS

**MR. YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the statement made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives in a speech he delivered recently in Connecticut. He asked a rhetorical question:

Should we use our atomic power to wipe out Red China's atomic capability?

Then he added:

We must get ready to do this very thing if we want to stop Red China. I will insist on

victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable.

In this same speech the gentleman also stated:

And even if we win the war in South Vietnam, I cannot help but think that we are merely postponing the final victory of Red China unless the Nation is prepared to risk the possible consequences of destroying her nuclear capability. And unless we make that decision, it is possible that all of our fighting in South Vietnam will have been in vain.

In other words this Member of the other body really outdid some hard-nosed militarists in our Armed Forces who in the past have been advocating preemptive war against the Soviet Union and in recent months have raised their voices advocating a sneak attack or preemptive war on Red China to destroy the crude nuclear installations of the Red Chinese. The very suggestion of this is so un-American as to be abhorrent. Yet, here is a Member of the other body occupying the position as chairman of one of the most powerful committees in that body advocating this procedure.

Mr. President, the facts are that I am a fervent believer in the seniority system. It is one of the advantages of our Congress that under that system, men who have served long years in the Senate and in the House of Representatives attain promotions within the committees of which they are members, and finally some of them with long years of congressional service become chairmen of committees. By and large, chairmen of all the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are eminently respected, are most knowledgeable, and deserve the promotion to chairmen by reason of the experience that they have acquired over the years.

Nevertheless, it is somewhat shattering to my faith in this seniority system to read of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives advocating a suicidal policy on our part, and I feel obligated to speak out against this without delay lest in this country and overseas such a rhetorical question would be taken seriously.

That the person making this statement is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the other body causes me to fear that in Europe and Asia, among the heads of states, it might be regarded as authoritative and that his views are respected and might be followed. Were we as a nation to undertake any such course, we could gain nothing except, at most, a very temporary advantage and at a great price—loss of respect and degradation.

Now let us consider the facts. No matter what single location or several locations we might bomb and utterly destroy into ashes within the mainland of China, that nation—Communist China—with its great population, its far-flung geographic area, and its scientists and scholars would retain the capability of very soon again producing even more nuclear weapons and far better and more powerful than the first crude warheads produced there. We should realize that

in this nuclear age of change and challenge even a small group of scientists are just as valuable or more valuable to any nation, to China and to this Nation, than any existing nuclear installations.

Assuming that we could destroy China's capability for producing nuclear weapons for a short time and that we did destroy all the existing nuclear installations, how could we possibly bar or prevent the access of the Chinese to the raw materials necessary for the production of fissionable nuclear charges? Assume we did hurl our air power over the Chinese mainland, as this gentleman suggests. Would we have our Air Force attempt to lay waste all of the factories that they behold below them where they might suspect that some use was being made of raw materials to manufacture nuclear bombs? How could we do that anyway when it is readily possible for men of intelligence to disperse such installations and even locate them in cities in the midst of massive centers of population or underground in other sections of the country in such manner that our bombs could not destroy them?

Then, above everything else, it would not be possible for us with our missile power, air power, and land forces to kill all of those individuals who comprehend how atomic weapons are made. In other words, even now in a preemptive war in a day of infamy followed by other days of infamy, were we to destroy the lives of millions of Chinese men, women, and children, we could not possibly kill off all the scientists.

I am mentioning this to state how foolhardy the gentleman's proposal is. Let us realize that China is a huge nation that has great diversity and a great quantity of natural resources; that there are 700 million men, women and children living within the borders of China; that China is a nation with a great history and its people have a tradition of being industrious. The Chinese are people of high intellectual attainments and business and scientific achievements. They have a great cultural background. It is obvious to all that China is now a great power and within 10 or 20 years it will be one of the three greatest powers on the earth.

We are proud of the American citizens we have in our midst, in Hawaii and elsewhere, men, women and children of Chinese descent. We have in this body as a U.S. Senator from the sovereign State of Hawaii HIRAM FONG, one of the ablest and most respected Members of this body, whose father and mother and all his ancestors were Chinese and lived in China.

I advert to that fact to indicate another facet and to indicate how foolhardy that suggestion or rhetorical question was.

Furthermore, there is nothing Representative RIVERS or anyone else can do to stop China's advance. Even the grossly inhumane use of atomic and bacteriological weapons could not do that. Let us hear no more about this rhetorical question. A proposal to do anything of this sort would be foreign to the American

August 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19783

tives and completely in character for the people of the United States, whose history bears testimony to those moral principles.

It is not responsive to say, as some do, that there is no military solution to the problems of South Vietnam. Everyone knows this. What must be recognized, however, is that because of the intransigence of the leaders in Hanoi, military victory is essential to lay the foundation for the political, economic, and psychological solutions to these problems.

Again in his address at Johns Hopkins University, the President firmly declared:

We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement.

And what are the essentials of a meaningful agreement?

Quite obviously these are the minimal objectives which the President has many times clearly stated and to which I have previously referred. Indeed, in the very same speech he said:

Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country. These are the essentials of any final settlement.

The interpretation of "unconditional negotiations" can be accurately made only in light of these statements by the President. The President could hardly clearly and succinctly state our minimal objectives and disdain a "meaningless agreement" in one part of his address and then impliedly repudiate his position by agreeing to negotiations which could lead to a "meaningless agreement."

For all their faults, the leaders in Hanoi were quick to understand this. What is so remarkable is that many leaders of other nations, political analysts, and news commentators apparently failed to understand it. Possibly in their zeal to end the hostilities in Vietnam, they have taken the phrase "unconditional negotiations" at its face value, standing by itself, without realizing that to do so would lift the words out of context of the full text of the Johns Hopkins address and attach a meaning which would undercut the integrity of the President's clearly stated objectives.

What the leaders in Hanoi understand and what others should understand is that any negotiations which lead to something less than the achievement of the minimal objectives stated by the President would be meaningless, and that only with respect to matters beyond these objectives can the negotiations be unconditional. There are many possibilities here. For example, the degree to which the leaders in Hanoi and the leaders of the Vietcong will be brought to trial and punished for war crimes, including the slaughter of South Vietnamese civilians and the murder of prisoners of war would be subject to negotiations, as would be the subject of reparations for damages to South Vietnam. The degree to which economic assistance would be extended to North Vietnam would be subject to negotiations. But our minimal objectives for South Vietnam cannot be subject to negotiation any

more than, as the late President Kennedy said on July 25, 1961:

The freedom of that city [Berlin] is not negotiable.

There is another way of considering the meaning of the phrase "unconditional negotiations" and that is in light of the minimal demands by Hanoi, namely: First, American withdrawal from South Vietnam; second, temporary neutralization; third, communization of South Vietnam by the so-called Vietnam National Liberation Front; and fourth, reunification of North and South Vietnam. Obviously to the extent that these points undercut our minimal objectives, they cannot be the subject of negotiation. Bitter history has taught us that neutralization to the Communists does not carry the same meaning as it does to us. A neutralist government containing militant Communists sooner or later ends up being subverted by the Communists who consider such a status as merely an opportunity for the communization of the government and the people. Accordingly, it is difficult to see how any of these points could be the subject of negotiations. Of course, withdrawal of American forces would follow upon achievement of our minimal objectives for South Vietnam, and to this extent such withdrawal would be readily agreed to and would not even have to be negotiated.

Theoretically, perhaps, reunification of North and South Vietnam might be the subject of negotiations. I say "theoretically" because of the difficulties in assuring elections that are truly free which would be the only possible basis for such reunification. Here, again, is where the Communists interpret the phrase "free elections" differently than we do. Their interpretation would permit the use of terrorist and coercive activities as a means of persuading the people to vote "freely" for a Communist government. The world has witnessed for a long time the distorted meaning of "free elections" as practiced in the Soviet Union.

It is for this reason that overemphasis has been placed on the words of President Johnson in his news conference of July 28, when he said:

We do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory, but we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

The President would, of course, like to see truly free elections, and I am sure, he would like to see some kind of international machinery which would guarantee such free elections. But he is just as familiar with the distorted concept of free elections held by the Communists as anyone else, and he is equally aware of the impossibility of establishing the international machinery needed to guarantee truly free elections throughout North and South Vietnam in the foreseeable future. That is why I believe there has been an overemphasis in some quarters on his words "or throughout all Vietnam

under international supervision", as contrasted with his words in the Johns Hopkins speech:

Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam.

Obviously such an independent South Vietnam would have to precede free elections throughout all Vietnam in the short range period of attainability.

Perhaps it would have been well for the President to have made this point clear instead of leaving it for logical inference from his earlier statements.

William R. Frye, writing in the Des Moines Register of August 3, said the United States has significantly modified its Vietnam peace terms in what he called "a major effort to negotiate its way out of the war." He went on to say:

The change in the American position consists essentially of three parts:

1. Washington now is prepared to envisage reunification of Vietnam by internationally supervised elections, as called for in the Geneva accords of 1954, even though, as many diplomats believe, this could lead to a Communist takeover.

Reunification has long been North Vietnam's objective. The United States has held out for partition, with guaranteed security and independence for South Vietnam.

2. The United States now is willing to regard Hanoi's oft-cited four points, which include an American withdrawal from Vietnam, as part of the agenda for negotiation—though not the exclusive agenda nor as a precondition for a parley.

This is regarded as a major concession. Previously, although President Johnson had offered to take part in "unconditional discussion," the four points had been considered an unnegotiable demand for surrender.

Third. The United States is willing to find some face-saving formula for including the Vietcong—National Liberation Front—at a peace table. Previously Washington had been unwilling to negotiate with the Vietcong, except as part of the North Vietnamese delegation.

And Mr. Frye concludes that the American peace drive has two facets:

Private overtures, through U Thant and other intermediaries, offering to scale down the American asking price for peace; and public gestures, primarily to the U.N., inviting action by Thant and the U.N. Security Council.

These are provocative words by a perceptive writer. They lend credence to the report in the Des Moines Register of August 8 that the Johnson administration last fall rejected a proposal for peace talks which had been accepted without conditions by North Vietnam.

Let me quote from that report:

The proposal \* \* \* did not set any conditions, but the Johnson administration rejected it, it is said, for two reasons:

1. Mr. Johnson was engaged in the election battle with former Senator Barry Goldwater, who was advocating stronger U.S. military action in the Vietnam war. If word of peace talks had leaked out, Goldwater might have capitalized on it as a sign of weakness and damaged the Democratic campaign.

2. The South Vietnamese Government was in turmoil. Opposition to the military regime of Premier Nguyen Khanh was growing and Washington believed that negotiation with the Communists might cause the government to fall.

It is for this reason that I hope the President will not leave to conjecture

19784

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 16, 1965

any interpretation of the policy objectives which he has heretofore so firmly set forth. His every word is being scrutinized most carefully by writers, columnists, commentators, those who have been critical of his policies, those who have, as I have, been supporting his policy in Vietnam, and, most particularly, the Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow. The slightest deviation from our minimal objectives will be seized upon as a sign of weakness by the Communist World.

In evaluating any agreement to enter into negotiations, I believe it would be prudent to take note of a memorandum from Red China's Mao Tse-tung to the Soviet Union in March of 1953. It appears on pages 5707-5708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29, 1954, volume 100, part 5, 83d Congress, 2d session. This memorandum should be read and studied by everyone and particularly by our policymakers in the State Department and by those who would, in effect, have us bargain away the peace and freedom of South Vietnam and southeast Asia.

The memorandum is a blueprint of conquest of Asia by the Communists.

It outlines a program which has succeeded all too well, even though parts of the timetable have been thrown off to some degree. Through Mao's timing has been off—because the United States unexpectedly intervened and because of the Red China-Soviet Union dispute over how best to further Communist imperialism—the memorandum serves as a *Mein Kampf* of Communist conquest and domination.

It should be emphasized that Mao anticipated that most of the gains are to be made through armistices and negotiations.

First of all, Mao declared:

It appears that time has come that we have to look upon Asia as our immediate goal. In Asia—

He said—

tactics of internal revolution, infiltration or intimidation into inaction or submission will yield an abundant harvest.

Pointing to the weakness within the Communist World, Mao wrote:

Consequently, we have to, until we are certain of victory, take a course which will not lead to war.

One course—

He continued—

is to isolate the United States by all possible means.

Then Britain must be placated by being convinced that there is a possibility of settling the major issues between the East and the West and that the Communists and the capitalist countries can live in peace. Opportunities for trade will have a great influence on the British mind.

Listen to what Mao had to say about France:

In the case of France, her war weariness and fear of Germany must be thoroughly exploited. She must be made to feel a sense of greater security in cooperating with us than with the Western countries.

And on Japan:

Japan must be convinced that rearmament endangers instead of guaranteeing her national security and that, in case of war, the American forces distributed all over the

world cannot spare sufficient strength for the defense of Japan. Rearmament is, therefore, an expression of hostility toward her potential friends. Her desire to trade will offer great possibilities for steering Japan away from the United States.

Before I turn to specific areas of conquest set out in the blueprint, let me quote the section on military preparedness:

As a final goal, there should be in east and southeast Asia (after these areas are liberated) 25 million well-trained men who can be immediately mobilized. These men are to be held in readiness for emergency. They will achieve two purposes. On the one hand they will force the capitalist countries to keep on increasing defense expenses until economic collapse overtakes them. On the other hand, a mere show of force, when time is ripe, will bring about the capitulation of the ruling cliques of the countries to be liberated.

Note the emphasis of liberation. The idea of a "war of liberation" is the chief propaganda weapon in the hands of the aggressors in Vietnam today.

Mao also had some comments on the Korean war, which was raging at the time his memorandum was written.

He said:

The important reason that we cannot win decisive victory in Korea is our lack of naval strength. Without naval support, we have to confine our operations to frontal attacks along a line limited by sea. Such actions always entail great losses and are seldom capable of destroying the enemy. In March 1951, I suggested to Comrade Stalin to make use of the Soviet submarines in Asia under some arrangement that the Soviet Union would not be apparently involved in the war. Comrade Stalin preferred to be cautious lest it might give the capitalist imperialism the pretext of expanding the war to the continent. I agreed with his point of view.

Until we are better equipped for victory, it is to our advantage to accept agreeable terms for an armistice.

Here is what Mao had to say about Formosa:

Formosa must be incorporated into the People's Republic of China, because of the government's commitment to the people. If seizure by force is to be avoided for the time being, the entry of the Chinese People's Government into the United Nations may help solve this problem. If there should be serious obstacles to the immediate transfer of Formosa to the control of the People's Government, a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa as an intermediary step could be taken into consideration.

This should serve as a warning to those who advocate that Red China be admitted to the United Nations regardless of the fact that she does not qualify for admission under the Charter of the United Nations.

Now let us examine Mao's pronouncements on Indochina. It should be remembered that at the time the memorandum was prepared France was still fighting to maintain her colonial interests there. And those who talk of "free elections" in Vietnam would do well to keep his words in mind:

We shall give the maximum assistance to our comrades and friends in Indochina. The experiences we have had in Korea should enrich their knowledge in fighting for liberation. The case of Indochina cannot be compared with that of China. In Indochina, as in Korea, there is serious intervention of

the capitalist bloc, while in China there was nothing so direct and vigorous. The experiences in Korea tell us that so long as there is foreign intervention and so long as we have no naval support, military operations alone cannot achieve the objective of liberation.

The military operations in Indochina should be carried out to such an extent as to make the war extremely unpopular among the French people and to make the French and Americans extremely hateful among the Indochinese people. The object is to force the French to back out of Indochina preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice. Once foreign intervention is out of the picture, vigorous propaganda, infiltration, forming united fronts with the progressive elements in and outside the reactionary regimes will accelerate the process of liberation. A final stroke of force will accomplish the task. Two years may be needed for this work.

Two years later France was out of Indochina.

But Mao's blueprint for complete domination of what was formerly Indochina was stalled when the United States decided that freedom for the people and the peace of southeast Asia required our assistance.

To those who maintain that South Vietnam is of little importance to us strategically, that we have no business there, that the Communists would settle for "that one little piece of ground." Mao's own words supply the answer:

After the liberation of Indochina, Burma will fall in line as good foundation has already been laid there. The then reactionary ruling clique in Thailand will capitulate and the country will be in the hands of the people. The liberation of Indonesia, which will fall to the Communist camp as a ripe fruit, will complete the circle around the Malay Peninsula.

The British will realize, under these circumstances, the hopelessness of putting up a fight and will withdraw as quickly as they can.

If war can be averted, the success of our plan of peaceful penetration for the other parts of Asia is almost assured.

Even then Mao considered Indonesia ripe picking. And who can say he was in error when one considers the actions of Indonesia's Sukarno, who continues to castigate the United States and act like a puppet of Red China? That is why our continuation of aid to Indonesia makes so little sense. And it makes even less sense that the United States has paid Indonesia \$350,000 to assist that nation to operate a small atomic research reactor, as reported in the Washington Post of August 7. The funds were provided only last month.

The second secession of Singapore from the Malaysia Federation could signal the start of another period of chaos in southeast Asia, as one commentator put it, with serious consequences for the struggle to resist communism there.

Finally, the memorandum states that India should not bear the brunt of hostile actions, that only peaceful means should be adopted. Why?

Because—

Said Mao—

any employment of force will alienate ourselves from the Arabic countries and Africa, because India is considered to be our friend.

Mr. President, these are the main points of the memorandum of 12 years

August 16, 1965

19785

ago from the one who was then and who now is the leader of Red China. He was not writing for literary effect. He meant what he said.

With so much talk about negotiations today, I view with misgivings that our Ambassador W. Averell Harriman and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, as reported in the Washington Post on August 9, suggested that Hanoi is not a likely target of American air attacks against North Vietnam.

According to the report, General Taylor argued against bombing the North Vietnamese capital because "we need the leadership in Hanoi to be intact to make those essential decisions we hope they will make at some time."

This seems to contradict Secretary of State Rusk's statement that there will be no privileged sanctuary for supporters of the Vietcong insurgency.

And it recalls that there were no privileged sanctuaries for Adolf Hitler and his leaders during World War II. Nevertheless, the Nazi leaders were sufficiently "intact" to make the essential decisions to end the war.

It is not helpful to our cause to give comfort to those who promote aggression. If our leaders intend to pursue a policy of firmness, they should avoid any statements which might be construed as a sign of deviation from that policy.

I am concerned over suggestions, which seemingly appear as trial balloons, that we may settle for less than what the President has stated to be our minimal objectives. I am concerned also that the President's critics—some from within his own party—appear to look only at Vietnam without considering the whole picture so carefully considered by Mao Tsetung. They ignore the Communist objectives in Thailand, in Laos, in Cambodia, in Burma, in Japan, in the Philippines, in India, and even in Australia.

That is why it is time for all to understand the true meaning of the phrase "unconditional negotiations."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum to which I referred in my speech, and which appears at page 5708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**AN OUTLINE OF MAO TSE-TUNG'S MEMORANDUM ON NEW PROGRAM FOR WORLD REVOLUTION**  
(Carried to Moscow by Chou En-lai in March 1953)

#### 1. ASIA TO BE THE IMMEDIATE GOAL

Due to the profound leadership of Comrade Stalin, amazing achievements have been made in the great task of world revolution. The success that has been attained both in Europe and in Asia after World War II is entirely attributable to Comrade Stalin's able and correct guidance and direction. May his wisdom still guide us.

It appears that time has come that we have to look upon Asia as our immediate goal. Under the present circumstances, any vigorous action in Europe such as internal revolution, effective infiltration, or intimidation into inaction, or submission is now impossible (Communist terminology is different, this represents what it really means) more forcible measures may bring about a war. In Asia, on the contrary, such tactics will yield an abundant harvest.

#### 2. WORLD WAR TO BE TEMPORARILY AVOIDED

There is no assurance of victory because of the higher rate of industrial production and larger stockpile of atomic weapons on the part of the capitalist countries, incompleteness of antiautomic defenses of the industrial areas and oil installations in the Soviet Union, and immaturity of China's agricultural and industrial developments. Consequently, we have to, until we are certain of victory, take a course which will not lead to war.

#### 3. DIPLOMATIC OFFENSIVE

The United States must be isolated by all possible means.

Britain must be placated by being convinced that there is possibility of settling the major issues between the East and the West and that the Communists and the capitalist countries can live in peace. Opportunities for trade will have a great influence on the British mind.

In the case of France, her war weariness and fear of Germany must be thoroughly exploited. She must be made to feel a sense of greater security in cooperating with us than with the Western countries.

Japan must be convinced that rearmament endangers instead of guaranteeing her national security and that, in case of war, the American forces distributed all over the world cannot spare sufficient strength for the defense of Japan. Rearmament is, therefore, an expression of hostility toward her potential friends. Her desire to trade will offer great possibilities for steering Japan away from the United States.

#### 4. MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

As a final goal, there should be in east and southeast Asia (after these areas are liberated) 25 million well-trained men who can be immediately mobilized. These men are to be held in readiness for emergency. They will achieve two purposes. On the one hand they will force the capitalist countries to keep on increasing defense expenses until economic collapse overtakes them. On the other hand, a mere show of force, when time is ripe, will bring about the capitulation of the ruling cliques of the countries to be liberated.

#### 5. THE KOREAN WAR

The important reason that we cannot win decisive victory in Korea is our lack of naval strength. Without naval support, we have to confine our operations to frontal attacks along a line limited by sea. Such actions always entail great losses and are seldom capable of destroying the enemy. In March 1951 I suggested to Comrade Stalin to make use of the Soviet submarines in Asia under some arrangement that the Soviet Union would not be apparently involved in the war. Comrade Stalin preferred to be cautious lest it might give the capitalist imperialism the pretext of expanding the war to the Continent. I agreed with his point of view.

Until we are better equipped for victory, it is to our advantage to accept agreeable terms for an armistice.

#### 6. FORMOSA

Formosa must be incorporated into the People's Republic of China because of the Government's commitment to the people. If seizure by force is to be avoided for the time being, the entry of the Chinese People's Government into the United Nations may help solve this problem. If there should be serious obstacles to the immediate transfer of Formosa to the control of the People's Government, a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa as an intermediary step could be taken into consideration.

#### 7. INDOCHINA

We shall give the maximum assistance to our comrades and friends in Indochina. The experiences we have had in Korea should

enrich their knowledge in fighting for liberation. The case of Indochina cannot be compared with that of China. In Indochina, as in Korea, there is serious intervention of the capitalist bloc, while in China there was nothing so direct and vigorous. The experiences in Korea tell us that so long as there is foreign intervention and so long as we have no naval support, military operations alone cannot achieve the objective of liberation.

The military operations in Indochina should be carried out to such an extent as to make the war extremely unpopular among the French people and to make the French and Americans extremely hateful among the Indochinese people. The object is to force the French to back out of Indochina preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice. Once foreign intervention is out of the picture, vigorous propaganda, infiltration, forming united fronts with the progressive elements in and outside the reactionary regimes will accelerate the process of liberation. A final stroke of force will accomplish the task. Two years may be needed for this work.

#### 8. BURMA, THAILAND, INDONESIA, AND MALAY PENINSULA

After the liberation of Indochina, Burma will fall in line as good foundation has already been laid there. The then reactionary ruling clique in Thailand will capitulate and the country will be in the hands of the people. The liberation of Indochina, which will fall to Communist camp as a ripe fruit, will complete the circle around the Malay Peninsula.

The British will realize, under these circumstances, the hopelessness of putting up a fight and will withdraw as quickly as they can. We expect that the whole process will be completed in or before 1960.

#### 9. JAPAN AND INDIA

By 1960 China's military, economic and industrial power will be so developed that with a mere show of force by the Soviet Union and China, the ruling clique of Japan will capitulate and a peaceful revolution will take place. We must be on guard against the possibility that the United States will choose to have war at this moment. She may even want the war earlier. The defensive and offensive preparations of the Soviet Union and China must, therefore, be completed before 1960. Whether we can prevent the United States from starting the war depends upon how much success we have in isolating her and how effective is our peace offensive. If the war can be averted, the success of our plan of peaceful penetration for the other parts of Asia is almost assured.

In the case of India, only peaceful means should be adopted. Any employment of force will alienate ourselves from the Arabic countries and Africa, because India is considered to be our friend.

#### 10. ARABIC COUNTRIES AND AFRICA

After India has been won over, the problems of the Philippines and the Arabic countries can be easily solved by economic cooperation, alliances, united fronts, and coalitions. This task may be completed in 1965. Then a wave of revolution will sweep over the whole continent of Africa and the imperialists and the colonizers will be quickly driven into the sea. In fact this powerful movement may have been underway much earlier.

With Asia and Africa disconnected with the capitalist countries in Europe, there will be a total economic collapse in Western Europe. There capitulation will be a matter of course.

#### 11. THE UNITED STATES

Crushing economic collapse and industrial breakdown will follow the European crisis.

August 16, 1965

Canada and South America will find themselves in the same hopeless and defenseless condition. Twenty years from now, world revolution will be an accomplished fact. If the United States should ever start a war, she would do so before the liberation of Japan, the Philippines, and India. The courses of action in that event are outlined in the memorandum on military aid.

**Mr. MILLER.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed an article entitled "The Big If," by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop, dated August 6; an article entitled "Major U.S. Modification of Viet Peace Terms," by Mr. William R. Frye, in the August 3 issue of the Des Moines Register; an article entitled "Johnson Throws Support to Thant," by Max Freedman, published in the Washington Evening Star on August 5; an article entitled "Report U.S. Rejected Peace Bid Last Fall," by Darius S. Jhabvala, published in the August 8 issue of the Des Moines Register; an article entitled "Hanoi Seen as Unlikely Air Target," by Frank C. Porter, published in the Washington Post on August 9; and finally, an article entitled "United States Gave \$350,000 for Indonesia Reactor," by Richard Halloran, published in the August 7 issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE BIG IF

(By Joseph Alsop)

The history of the American role in the war in Vietnam has thus far been stamped all over, in large letters, "Too Little and Too Late."

A good illustration is President Kennedy's 1961 decision to make an important increase in the American contribution.

The people who were trying for Brownie points by carrying on a personal vendetta against the late President Ngo Dinh Diem elaborately pooh-poohed the results of this decision by President Kennedy. General Harkins and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara were bitterly denounced for over-optimistic estimates of the war situation in 1962.

By now, however, prisoner interrogations and other undoubted intelligence have revealed that the Vietcong came fairly close to defeat at that time. The modern weapons that the United States supplied to the South Vietnamese Army, and the major step-up in South Vietnamese fighting power, knocked the Communists temporarily but rather completely off balance.

Instead of being criticized for overoptimism, in fact, Secretary McNamara should have been attacked on another point—the failure to act on one of the 1961 recommendations, to backup the South Vietnamese army with American tactical airpower.

Very few people are aware of it, but the fact is that the most important part of President Johnson's Pleiku decision last winter was not the order to bomb North Vietnamese targets. As the decision was implemented, the bombing sorties against the north were more for show than effect for many months on end. But President Johnson's simultaneous removal of all "wraps" from the use of American tactical airpower in South Vietnam had a profound effect.

Without this other, much less publicized step, the war might well have been lost by now. And if this same step had been taken when the American contribution was increased in 1961, the war might well have been won in the period when the Vietcong were so badly knocked off balance.

These facts are relevant at the moment, because the increase in U.S. troop strength in Vietnam, which President Johnson announced last week, is currently being denounced as "too little and too late." For once in a way, however, this appears not to be true.

In brief, the U.S. field commander, General Westmoreland, was given quite literally everything he asked for. The armed services were not, however, given all that they asked for as soon as General Westmoreland's requests were in. Thus the callup of Reserves was deferred, for instance.

In these circumstances, the really disquieting aspect of the President's news conference was the interminable and effusive discussion of negotiations with the North Vietnamese. This has left the impression, in the country and throughout the world, that the United States is prepared to stop fighting the next morning after being asked to begin talking.

The big "if," of course, is whether enough progress can be made in Vietnam to force the Communists to ask for negotiations. If that happens, one may be quite certain the circumstances will broadly resemble those in Korea in June-July 1951, when the Chinese Communists asked for negotiations.

The reason for the Chinese request was simple. The United States and South Korean armies had made a superb recovery in the months since the disaster on the Yalu. In June-July 1951, a powerful offensive threatened the whole Chinese and North Korean front. That was why the Chinese were ready to begin talking.

Unhappily, the offensive was stopped dead in its tracks when talks were requested. The Chinese got a respite. Two more bitter years of fighting followed before the signature of the unsatisfactory peace. The war in Vietnam is a direct sequel and result.

It is a serious matter, therefore, if the impression is conveyed that the United States is again ready to commit the same silly folly that was committed in Korea in the summer of 1951.

In reality, this impression that President Johnson conveyed is almost certainly misleading. He talks of unconditional negotiations because the intention is to keep the pressure on the enemy until an acceptable settlement is agreed upon. But the President will still be wise to remove the false impression, for there are plenty of people who have forgotten the Korean folly and will howl like banshees for a repetition of it, unless the President clears the air in advance.

#### MAJOR U.S. MODIFICATION OF VIET PEACE TERMS

(By William R. Frye)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The United States has significantly modified its Vietnam peace terms in a major effort to negotiate its way out of the war, it has been learned here.

Chief U.S. Delegate Arthur J. Goldberg informed U.N. Secretary General U Thant of the new stand on Wednesday. Thant, who thereupon publicly vowed to redouble his peace efforts, is expected to relay the proposals to Hanoi and Peiping promptly.

The change in the American position consists essentially of three parts:

1. Washington now is prepared to envisage reunification of Vietnam by internationally supervised elections, as called for in the Geneva accords of 1954, even though, as many diplomats believe, this could lead to a Communist takeover.

Reunification has long been North Vietnam's objective. The United States has held out for partition, with guaranteed security and independence for South Vietnam.

2. The United States now is willing to regard Hanoi's oft-cited "four points," which include an American withdrawal from Vietnam, as part of the agenda for negotiation—

though not the exclusive agenda nor as a precondition for a parley.

This is regarded as a major concession. Previously, although President Johnson had offered to take part in "unconditional discussions," the four points had been considered an unnegotiable demand for surrender. The points involve (a) American withdrawal; (b) temporary neutralization; (c) communization of South Vietnam; (d) then reunification.

3. The United States is willing to find some face-saving formula for including the Vietcong (National Liberation Front) at a peace table. Previously, Washington had been unwilling to negotiate with the Vietcong except as part of the North Vietnamese delegation.

This large-scale United States "peace offensive" has placed Hanoi and Peiping under significant new pressure to negotiate an end to the Vietnam war, U.N. diplomats believe.

#### PRIVATE AND PUBLIC MOVES

The American peace drive has two facets: Private overtures, through U Thant and other intermediaries, offering to scale down the American asking price for peace; and public gestures, primarily to the U.N., inviting action by Thant and the U.N. Security Council.

U.N. diplomats and observers are more impressed by the private moves than by the public gestures, though they believe both contribute to useful pressure on the Communists.

In offering to negotiate the reunification of Vietnam under internationally supervised elections the United States has offered, in effect, to reverse its 10-year effort at partition, provided only that the elections are genuinely free, and certified as such by an international authority.

#### SOMETHING TO WORK WITH

It was never clear in the 1950's that the Communists would let the elections be free, even though many observers believed they could win them. They wanted victory to be not merely probable, but certain. This point could easily prove once again to be a major stumbling block. But if so, the United States will be in a strong moral and propaganda position, U.N. people believe.

The Secretary General is represented as feeling he now has something negotiable to work on. But whether the Vietcong having believed themselves on the verge of military victory, will agree to negotiate on any basis for any purpose is considered problematical. Strenuous efforts will be made to persuade them to do so.

It is presumed here, without firm knowledge, that Presidential roving Ambassador W. Averell Harriman went to Moscow hoping to induce Moscow to join in this pressure on Hanoi.

#### DOESN'T WANT U.N. DEBATE

If after a reasonable period—the word "reasonable" has not been made precise—the Communists still refuse to negotiate, even on a basis which includes their own proposals, the United States is expected to plunge into the war on a major scale.

The public phase of the American "peace offensive" is regarded here as useful but less meaningful.

The U.N. does not believe the United States really expects, or even wants, a public debate on Vietnam in the U.N. Security Council at this stage, despite an invitation to Council members Friday by Delegate Goldberg to "somehow find the means to respond effectively" to the southeast Asia "challenge."

A public debate would virtually oblige the Soviet Union to take a violent public posture critical of the United States, it is pointed out, at a time when efforts are being made to cushion the damaging impact of Vietnam on Soviet-American relations and avoid a future confrontation.

August 16, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

Moscow, too, is said to be opposed to a Vietnam debate in the U.N. Neither the United States nor any other country has formally moved for one.

Repeated statements by Washington that the United States is willing are taken as gestures to American domestic critics, who want the U.N. to help make peace, perhaps without fully realizing what U.N. intervention would mean at this stage.

## JOHNSON THROWS SUPPORT TO THANT

(By Max Freedman)

The effect on the United Nations of President Johnson's new initiatives on Vietnam can be summarized in two sentences. Up to now Secretary General U Thant has been following his own instincts, working often at haphazard, and always barren of results. Now he is supported by the full authority of the United States, the whole world knows it, and he can act with new confidence and assurance. In a situation filled with uncertainty and danger his new bargaining power is at least one small hope for peace.

In the past there has been rather savage criticism of the Secretary General in the American press. He has been accused of being so impartial that he has seen no difference between Communist subversion and the resistance offered by the United States.

This press criticism has received no support from the Johnson administration. As a matter of deliberate and far-sighted policy, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the President all wanted to preserve the Secretary General's undamaged authority. They knew the time might come when the Secretary General could be very useful in bringing the problems of Vietnam to the conference table. Perhaps that time has not yet arrived but at least he has begun to move in that direction.

It has often been said that the Secretary General has no mandate to do anything in this dispute since neither North Vietnam nor China belongs to the United Nations. That is not correct. Under the charter he has a general mandate to bring to the attention of the United Nations any problem disturbing the peace. He is now able to use the powers of his office not only as they were defined in the charter but as they were interpreted and expanded by the late Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

Beyond all question any hope of a negotiated settlement rests on the Secretary General. Any effort made by an individual government to promote a settlement will be coordinated with the work of the Secretariat even if nothing is said of this cooperation in public. Thus, the United Nations always will be in the background and its authority can be used at the right moment.

When he was asked if the United States would support an immediate cease-fire, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg replied that a cease-fire is without meaning unless it leads to a negotiated settlement of the dispute. There is another answer that is equally important. The United States must be very skeptical of any arrangement that seems to give the Vietcong the title to the land that they are holding at the time of the cease-fire. Any such formula would weaken and dismember South Vietnam and make its survival as an independent political entity completely impossible.

This explains why the rulers of South Vietnam are being so cautious about the role of the United Nations. They want to know what the United Nations can do to guarantee that South Vietnam will in fact have a free choice in a supervised election to chart its own political course. The United States is pledged to respect the freedom of South Vietnam while being willing to accept the unity of all Vietnam. This is a pleasant and ingenious formula, so long as it does not have to be tested, but it enshrines a contra-

diction and may fall apart under the pull of events.

By every token, the Secretary General knows better than officials in Washington how fragile and contradictory this principle really is. He has asked for urgent studies to be made on the problems of supervised elections so that South Vietnam's freedom of choice will be a reality rather than an illusion. He also has made it clear that the conference room must be a place for genuine negotiations instead of being a place where the military gains of the Communist forces are ratified and accepted.

These two principles, deeply held at the United Nations, should reassure South Vietnam that no one is contemplating a diplomatic sellout in the abused name of peace.

In these early stages it is impossible to know what the Soviet Union will do. If she is ready to minimize the risks of war, she will not use her veto or organize resistance to the United Nations effort. It all depends on how far the Soviet Union wishes to go in widening her quarrel with Communist China and in reducing her influence in North Vietnam. The Secretary General is now trying to find the answer to these questions by delicate personal diplomacy.

Even China may hesitate before she rebukes and defies the United Nations. Yet the Secretary General, even if his present efforts should fail, would have provided another and conclusive proof of the desire of the United States to find an honorable end to the war in Vietnam.

## REPORT UNITED STATES REJECTED PEACE BID LAST FALL

(By Darius S. Jhabvala)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The Johnson administration last fall rejected a proposal for Vietnam peace talks that had been accepted without conditions by Communist North Vietnam, it was learned Saturday.

This information, from reliable sources, is in direct conflict with President Johnson's statement at his July 28 press conference that "we are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table."

The opportunity for a private and unpublicized discussion with representatives of the Hanoi regime occurred early last fall, at the height of the U.S. presidential election campaign.

## NO CONDITIONS

The proposal, made by a non-Communist Asian diplomat, was accepted by Hanoi, which did not set forth any conditions.

But the Johnson administration rejected it, is said, for two reasons:

Mr. Johnson was engaged in the election battle with former Senator Barry Goldwater, who was advocating stronger U.S. military action in the Vietnam war. If word of peace talks had leaked out, Goldwater might have capitalized on it as a sign of weakness and damaged the Democratic campaign.

The South Vietnamese Government was in turmoil. Opposition to the military regime of Premier Nguyen Khanh was growing, and Washington believed that negotiations with the Communists might cause the government to fall (it did fall later).

Saturday, an informed State Department source, asked about the story, replied, "The President was never involved in that one." He said it was one of many contacts over a long period of time. "There were contacts going on almost every other week."

## ABOUT PROCEDURE

But, he said, this particular contact concerned only the procedure for a meeting and there was no hint that anything would come from it.

He said "the election did not have anything to do with it."

The effort to initiate direct talks was made

shortly after the August 1964 Gulf of Tonkin crisis, in which the United States conducted its first two air strikes against North Vietnam in retaliation for PT boat attacks on American warships in the gulf.

That was 6 months before the present U.S. air offensive against North Vietnam began last February 7.

Not long before it accepted the proposal for direct talks, Hanoi had rejected an invitation by the United Nations Security Council to participate in a debate on the Gulf of Tonkin crisis with the comment that only the signers of the 1954 Geneva accords were competent to study "the war acts committed by the United States." The United States was not a signatory.

## AT RANGOON

The proposal, suggesting Rangoon, Burma, as a meeting place, was discussed at the U.N. and then relayed to Hanoi by an emissary of the Soviet foreign ministry. There were hints of such a proposal at that time, but its fate was never made public.

Later proposals for peace talks were turned down by Hanoi, and the sources said Saturday they believed the U.S. rejection of the Rangoon talks caused Hanoi to stiffen its resistance to negotiations and to intensify its support of the Vietcong guerrilla war against South Vietnam.

U.S. officials have said several times that on no occasion has Hanoi shown a willingness to talk.

The sources pointed out Saturday that last fall's U.S. rejection and Hanoi acceptance of a negotiation proposal is now a footnote in history. They maintained, however, that had a meeting taken place, a road to peace in Vietnam might have been mapped out.

## HANOI SEEN AS UNLIKELY AIR TARGET—HARRIMAN, TAYLOR HINT STRONGLY THAT CITY WON'T BE HIT

(By Frank C. Porter)

W. Averell Harriman and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor both suggested yesterday that Hanoi is not a likely target in American air attacks against North Vietnam.

"Although there has been no assurance that we won't bomb Hanoi," Harriman said, "we are a long ways from it at the present time."

Taylor argued against bombing the North Vietnamese capital on grounds that "we need the leadership in Hanoi to be intact to make those essential decisions we hope they will make at some time." He would not say categorically, however, that the city is ruled out as a future target.

## RUSK'S WARNING

Although the Johnson administration has repeatedly said it has no present plans to strike Hanoi, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has warned there will be no privileged sanctuary for supporters of the Vietcong insurgency.

But Harriman and Taylor appeared to throw out strong hints that Hanoi may be indefinitely exempted.

And Harriman, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large who recently returned from talks with Russian Premier Alexei N. Kosygin and four other chiefs of state, went out of his way to calm American fears of further escalation of the Vietnamese conflict.

Asked about a serious military confrontation with Communist China, Harriman said, "I see no reason we should stir up the public to believing that is the danger. I do not believe it is a danger."

But should such a confrontation with China occur, Harriman told a panel on "Face the Nation" (CBS, WTOP), "we would have to count upon Moscow standing with Communist allies."

At the same time, Harriman said he came back from Moscow "with a very strong feeling that Mr. Kosygin and his colleagues are as anxious as we are to prevent escalation."

August 16, 1965

## MOSCOW'S STAND STATED

He stressed that the Soviet Union cannot play an overt role as peacemaker because of its competition with Peking for leadership of world communism. "They may be able to do things privately they are not able to do publicly," he added.

And although Moscow supports North Vietnam and liberation movements generally as the trend of the future, Harriman said Kosygin told him the Russians "believe in the 17th parallel (the dividing line between North and South Vietnam), indicating that there should be recognition of the rights of the South Vietnamese people."

In the same vein, Harriman said President Tito of Yugoslavia made it plain to him that South Vietnam should be allowed to have its independence and that Tito regards China as an aggressor nation and a dangerous one. "And I wouldn't be surprised if that was not only his view but also the Soviet view," Harriman added.

Taylor, former U.S. Ambassador to Saigon, was interviewed on Meet the Press (NBC-TV-WRC).

He said he would expect additional American forces to follow the buildup to 125,000 men announced by the administration. Asked if he thought a commitment of 300,000 to 400,000 might be needed later, Taylor said he did not think such a large force will be required.

He also was asked how long it might take to end the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

"I wouldn't expect anything less than 1 to 2 years," Taylor said.

General Taylor was reminded that in 1962 he and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara had said the United States might be able to wind up its involvement by Christmas of that year.

"At that time we had not had the political turbulence," Taylor said, referring to the subsequent overthrow of the Diem government and the long series of Saigon coups that followed.

The lack of governmental stability and of sufficient trained military manpower are the two most pressing problems in South Vietnam today, said Taylor.

But "the new and broadened U.S. commitment" to fill that manpower gap has given an "enormous lift" to South Vietnamese and Americans alike, he explained.

American air attacks north of the 17th parallel, Taylor said at another point, have had "a very clear depressant effect" on infiltration from the north.

## UNITED STATES GAVE \$350,000 FOR INDONESIA REACTOR

(By Richard Halloran)

The United States has paid Indonesia \$350,000 to assist the southeast Asian nation to operate a small atomic research reactor.

A State Department spokesman said yesterday that the sum was paid to fulfill an atoms-for-peace agreement made in 1960.

The reactor, situated at the Technical Institute of Bandung, was purchased from General Dynamics and went into operation last spring with uranium fuel leased from the United States.

Under terms of the agreement, the United States granted the \$350,000 after Indonesia got the facility running. The funds were given to Indonesia last month.

The United States must now decide whether to renew the 5-year agreement, which expires September 20. In light of Indonesian President Sukarno's pointed anti-American stance recently, the decision has strong political overtones.

No negotiations for renewing the agreement have been started with the Indonesian Government. The decision to go ahead or not will be made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and may go to President Johnson for approval.

If the United States decides not to renew the agreement, a problem in getting Indonesia to return the fuel may arise. Indonesia so far has observed the inspection and safety aspects of the agreement. But Sukarno's reaction to an adverse decision is unpredictable.

A second consideration is Sukarno's recent claims that Indonesia will soon have an atomic bomb. Informed sources say that the atoms-for-peace reactor cannot technically be used to build a military weapon.

The Bandung reactor is the only one known to be operating in Indonesia. A Russian-built subcritical reactor stopped running in 1963 when the Russians did not replenish the fuel.

Another Soviet reactor is under construction but not operating.

American assistance to Indonesia's atomic program has been criticized at home and abroad.

In Kuala Lumpur Thursday, Reuters reported Malaysian Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman said:

"Although America says the reactor is only meant for peaceful purposes, what guarantee is there that Sukarno will not use it for destruction purposes?"

Sukarno has vowed that Indonesia will "crush" Malaysia, which he considers a neo-colonial federation.

Earlier this week, Representative WILLIAM S. BROOKFIELD, Republican, of Michigan, was critical of American assistance to Indonesian atomic research.

## THROWING AWAY MARKETS—AND FARMERS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Al Capp, who is famed for his *Lil Abner* comic strip, recently conjured up little beings he designated as "Kigmies."

"Kigmies" in the cartoon world, ushered in an era of improved human relations because they enjoyed nothing more than a well-planted foot in the posterior. Angry and frustrated human beings could get relief from their frustrations and anger by kicking a Kigmie.

I mention this because of efforts to make real life Kigmies out of the wheat producers of the United States.

American wheat producers have just lost a share in the sale of 6.9 million tons of wheat to Russia and Eastern Europe within the past 2 weeks because of an unbelievably foolish policy, demanded by maritime unions and maintained by our Government, of requiring 50 percent of any wheat sold for dollars to Soviet bloc countries to be carried in American ships at nearly twice what it would cost to move the wheat in foreign vessels.

The news last week told of Canadian sales to a Russian trade delegation of 27.7 million bushels of wheat for shipment from western Canada, and another 187 million bushels for shipment from eastern Canada, including wheat equivalent of 400,000 tons of flour. A sale of 7 million bushels to Czechoslovakia was arranged during the week, and an independent purchase of 1.1 million tons was made from Argentina.

The delivered cost of this wheat will be about \$500 million. The Canadian wheat producers will receive in excess of \$300 million.

Russia is going to need even more wheat.

Dr. Richard Goodman of the Great Plains Wheat Council advises me that the best available information indicates the

Russian crop this year will be 40 to 41 million tons.

Between 1959 and 1963, the Russian crop has averaged 60 million tons.

Russia's requirements are 55 million tons for domestic consumption and 3 million tons for export to satellites.

Assuming a 41-million-ton crop and 7 million tons of purchases to date, Russia is still 7 million tons short of a normal supply for domestic use and 10 million tons of wheat short if her exports are calculated. Russia still needs wheat which we might sell if our unwise shipping rules were rescinded.

According to press reports, *Izvestia* has started indicating to the Russian people that corn is a fine cereal.

There are indications that Mr. Kosygin is conditioning his people for the news that they must tighten their belts on wheat consumption in the year ahead. She has booked just about all the wheat Canada can spare until she is certain of yields from the bumper crop that appears sure to be harvested in the western provinces. Argentina and Australia are out of the market at least until they know the size of their 1966 crop. And Russia has made one thing clear in the past: she will not pay more for American products than other purchasers from the United States have to pay, which is one effect of our 50 percent U.S. shipping requirement.

We are denying American wheat farmers access to a profitable commercial market by our self-defeating shipping requirement. We are asking Soviet purchasers to pay 11 to 12 cents per bushel more for wheat than other countries are asked to pay—because of the requirement that 50 percent must be shipped in U.S. ships. As a consequence, we are not selling a single bushel of wheat to the Russians or Eastern Europeans and there is every indication that they will continue to buy from our competitors or substitute corn as a cereal, before they will patronize us at extra cost, even as a residual demand supplier.

The shipping regulation, designed to placate two or three maritime unions, is helping no one at all. It is giving them 50 percent of nothing. It is depriving the United States of an opportunity to improve its balance of payments position by hundreds of millions of dollars.

While Canadian farmers are experiencing an economic boom and going into all out production, our wheat farmers are suffering from inadequate markets and from drastically curtailed production. While we develop a farm program paying people not to produce, the Canadians are forging ahead, increasing wheat acreage.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no reasonable justification for this self-defeating shipping restriction. It helps no one. It hurts virtually everybody. If anyone draws any satisfaction from the false hope that this silly shipping restriction is hurting the Russians and the East Europeans he should simply take a look at the Russian purchase missions which are securing grain from our competitors all over the world. All we are doing is sticking our heads in the sand at a cost of several hundred mil-